DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 040 657 HE 001 534

TITLE	The Governing of Princeton University. Final Report of the Special Committee on the Structure of the University.
INSTITUTION	Princeton Univ., N.J.
PUB DATE	Apr 70
NOTE	171p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$8.65
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrative Organization, Administrative Policy, Administrator Role, *Decision Making, Faculty, *Governance, Governing Boards, *Higher Education, *Student Participation, University Administration
IDENTIFIERS	*Princeton University

ABSTRACT

This report of the Special Committee on the Structure of the University proposes extensive modifications in the governing of Princeton University. Part I discusses the University's procedures for making decisions on important policy issues, including undergraduate and graduate courses of study, the appointment and advancement of members of the faculty, research contracts, the University's affiliation with other organizations and institutions, rules of conduct, and conflicts of interest. Part II discusses the organization of the University, including the Board of Trustees, the Presidency, the organization of the faculty, the undergraduate assembly, the organization of the graduate student body, a University Ombudsman, and a Committee on the Future of the University. Part III suggests ways of improving communication among the various constituents of the University. The recommendation on the proposed changes are included in the appendix. (AF)

3

2

ED040657

THE GOVERNING OF PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

Final Report of the Special Committee on the Structure of the University

April, 1970

HE001534

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED040657

PREFACE

THIS final report of the Special Committee on the Structure of the University proposes extensive modifications in the governing of Princeton University. We offer our reasons for proposing these changes and discuss at length the strengths and weaknesses of present arrangements.

The last two years of change and the adoption of the measures we propose will give Princeton a system of government that differs considerably from the one it had when our Committee was established. Both directly and through representatives, more people will participate in decisions on a wider range of issues, and it will be easier to raise issues, to get a hearing, to win the support of others, and to gain access to those formally responsible for making decisions. This system of government both reflects and furthers a redistribution of influence in the University. More important, however, we are convinced that it is a *better* system, and that its arrangements can provide a set of terms on which members of the University community can work together effectively.

With but one exception, the recommendations of this report are forwarded to the University community with our unanimous endorsement. They are the product of many hours of discussion. They reflect some give and take on points of judgment, but none on points of principle. As for the exception noted, we are divided in our views regarding the proposal to establish the Office of University Ombudsman. All of us think that the proposal deserves serious consideration, but a majority only is ready to speak for its adoption now.

We owe thanks to many. William G. Bowen and Dennis Gray participated in many of our discussions and much of our work. Edith Jeffrey was an exceptionally efficient and understanding staff assistant and so, later, was Samuel Alito. Doris McBride was somehow always able to do, just right, the many things we asked of her, from finding microphones to finding busy people. Marjorie Blake, Zaida Dillon, William Dix, and Rosemary Little helped us greatly in bringing and keeping together materials relevant to our work. Harwood Childs, Judith Rowe, Frederick Stephan, Edward R. Tufte, Joseph Verbalis, and Charles Westoff aided us in constructing the questionnaires we used in our formal

surveys of opinion, in administering those surveys, and in analyzing them. Marver Bernstein, Robert Cantor, John Craynock, John Irwin, Chapman Rose, and Dennis Thompson worked on special projects for us, and Wallace Hayes, Rufus Miles, and Bruce Walton contributed lengthy and thoughtful memoranda. Robert Durkee made initial drafts of two sections of this report, and Rosalie Feltenstein criticized much of it both for style and substance. Evelyn Parker did much of our typing, and Herbert Bailey and John Thompson saw us through the presses. Many others, students, faculty members, administrators, staff members, alumni, and Trustees gave us ideas, help, and criticism, though they must remain nameless here.

David P. Billington
Kathryn Boals
Richard D. Darby, Jr.
W. Joseph Dehner, Jr.
Robert F. Goheen
Sheldon Hackney
Mark W. Janis
Suzanne Keller
Stanley Kelley, Jr. (*Chairman*)
Harold W. Kuhn
Aaron Lemonick
John H. Marks
Bruce J. Neilson
R. Bruce Partridge
Thomas Travis (*Secretary*)
Dan W. Verser

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE		iii
INTRODUCTION		1
PART I:	PROCEDURES FOR SETTING POLICY	9
	The Undergraduate Course of Study	9
	Graduate Courses of Study	22
	The Appointment and Advancement of Faculty Members	27
	The Sponsorship of Research	37
	Affiliations with Organizations, the Leasing of Campus Property	39
	Rules of Conduct	42
	Conflicts of Interest	47
PART II:	THE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNIVERSITY	51
	The Board of Trustees	51
	The Presidency	66
	The Organization of the Faculty	70
	The Undergraduate Assembly	78
	The Organization of the Graduate Student Body	85
	A University Ombudsman	88
	A Committee on the Future of the University	91
PART III:	COMMUNICATION	94
APPENDICES		
	1. Proposed Changes in the Rules and Procedures of the Faculty	100
	2. Proposed Changes in the Constitution of the Undergraduate Assembly	116
	3. Proposal to Establish the Office of University Ombudsman	123
	4. Proposal to Establish the Right of Reply	125
	5. Proposal to Establish the Committee on the Future of the University	126

6. Additional Proposals 127
7. The Council of the Princeton University Community: Charter 138
8. Resolutions of the Faculty, June 2, 1969 153
9. Procedures of the Judicial Committee 155
10. Conduct of Hearings: The Judicial Committee 159
11. Statement of Policy on Delegation of Authority Adopted by the Board of Trustees of Princeton University, October 24, 1969 161
12. An Explanation of the Alternative Vote 164
13. An Explanation of the Single Transferable Vote 165

INTRODUCTION

SINCE the Special Committee on the Structure of the University was established in May, 1968, the composition of the University community has changed substantially. Some 4,000 students and members of the staff now at Princeton were not here then, and half that number are newly arrived this fall. It is therefore appropriate to introduce this report on the governing of the University with a review of the events that led to the establishment of our Committee, of the Committee's work so far, and of the circumstances in which its discussions have been carried on.

In the academic year 1967-1968 a number of questions of policy were raised and hotly debated at Princeton. The most important of these concerned the University's relationship to the Institute for Defense Analyses, the arrangements for counseling students about the draft, the rule regarding women visitors in dormitories, and the terms on which graduate students forced to leave Princeton because of the draft should be readmitted. On May 2, 1968, demonstrators demanded changes in the University's policies on all these matters. The mood on the campus at the time was tense: Concern about the issues raised in the demonstration was widespread and, for many, deeply felt. It is worth recalling also that similar issues had been among those that figured in the virtually complete breakdown of the normal course of academic life at Columbia University the previous week.

In the course of debating the issues of policy raised in the May 2 demonstration, some students and faculty members had also questioned the University's procedures for setting policy. A statement circulated among members of the faculty in late April and early May argued that Princeton's decision-making procedures

> were devised in a different era, when universities were in a different situation with regard to both their internal relations and their corporate relation to American society. It is clear that the time for a reappraisal of institutional procedures is long overdue.

The leaders of the demonstration of May 2 denounced as "irresponsible" several past decisions of the Administration and the

Board of Trustees and urged that "we must restructure the decision-making process so that those who live in the University and are most seriously affected by the decisions which control its future, are themselves the ones who make these decisions." This statement was the premise of the demand by the demonstration's leaders for a student-faculty committee "to determine a way of restructuring the decision-making apparatus of the University."

President Goheen indicated his approval of "a fresh and searching review of the decision-making process of the University by a properly constituted faculty-student committee." Acting in consultation with each other, the Administration, the Faculty, the Undergraduate Assembly, and an *ad hoc* committee of graduate students quickly took the necessary steps to establish a Special Committee on the Structure of the University and by June 15 all its members had been chosen. The Faculty elected eight members; the graduate student body, three; and the Undergraduate Assembly, four. President Goheen was a member *ex officio* and the Special Committee's Chairman was named by the Faculty's Committee on Committees in consultation with the members of the Special Committee. The formation of the Committee had been undertaken with the approval of the Board of Trustees, which itself established a Special Committee on Governance and Communication to consult with the student-faculty group.

In our first meetings in June, 1968, no member of our Committee had a comprehensive program for the reform of the University, and no one else presented us with such a program. Our first decision, unanimously taken, was to try to learn as much as we could as quickly as we could about the conduct of the University's affairs. From June 18 to June 28 and in the early fall we questioned students, members of the faculty, members of the Administration, and Trustees about a wide variety of subjects. We also collected and classified a large number of books, articles, and documents on university government and related subjects; invited all members of the University community to identify the problems they thought required our attention; and conducted formal surveys of faculty, graduate student, and undergraduate opinion on decision-making procedures at Princeton.

On October 8, 1968, three members of our Committee resigned.[1]

[1] Peter Kaminsky, Robert A. Nerenberg, and William H. Tucker.

In doing so, they argued that the Committee could not achieve significant reform and that their service on it was helping to create the illusion that basic differences in the University community were "in fact reconcilable through negotiation or discussion."[2] They also questioned the Committee's decisions regarding its relations with the Trustees, the extent to which its meetings should be open, and the extent to which it should concern itself with recommending action on the substance of specific and current issues of University policy. The vacancies created by the three resignations were filled by the Undergraduate Assembly and an *ad hoc* committee of graduate students,[3] and in our interim report we referred the questions that had been raised regarding our procedures to the Faculty, the Undergraduate Assembly, and an open meeting of graduate students. None of these bodies, however, issued new instructions.

By November, 1968, when our interim report was submitted, we had examined the University's procedures for making decisions on eight important and controversial subjects: Rules of conduct, research contracts, the University's affiliations with other institutions and organizations, relations with the local community, conflicts of interest, the budget, development plans, and investments. What we said in that report about the making of decisions on these matters cannot be briefly summarized; we did conclude, however, that those whose views had counted in these kinds of decisions were considerably fewer in number than those who had a legitimate interest in them and could contribute to making them. Tentatively, we suggested the desirability of creating "a body representative of the whole University community" to consider questions of policy of the sort we had reviewed. We also proposed that "rule-making powers currently exercised by the Board of Trustees with respect to undergraduate life should be delegated to students, to be exercised by them subject to the same kind of oversight to be given other rule-making groups." While the graduate student body took no formal action on our interim report, both the Faculty and the Undergraduate Assembly indicated their general approval of the direction in which the Committee was proceeding.

The present government of Princeton University differs very

[2] Statement of William H. Tucker, *Dissenter: Newsletter of Princeton SDS*, October 17, 1968.

[3] Mark Janis was appointed to represent undergraduate students and Kathryn D. Boals and Bruce J. Neilson to represent graduate students.

considerably from that which we examined in the spring and early fall of 1968.

In October, 1968, the Faculty gave final approval to a broad statement of policy regarding the rights and obligations of students that had already been approved by the Undergraduate Assembly. This statement (entitled *Students and the University*) was the product of almost two years' work by the President, the Faculty's Advisory Committee on Policy, and the Undergraduate Policy Committee. It affirmed the desirability of participation by students in decisions on policy and proposed several measures to enable them to participate more effectively. Committees elected by undergraduate majors were to be established in all academic departments, the objective of such committees being to "encourage students to participate in departmental affairs of special interest and relevance to them, to initiate proposals, and to seek discussion of any issue of general departmental importance." The Undergraduate Assembly was to be authorized to establish committees parallel to committees of the Faculty. The President of the University and the officers of the Undergraduate Assembly were to be empowered to add two student members to all Faculty committees whose work would in their judgment benefit from that action. The Undergraduate Committee on Policy was to meet with the President and the Faculty Advisory Committee on Policy for discussions of questions of University policy. All these measures were soon implemented: By the spring of 1969 committees of undergraduate students existed in virtually all departments; the Undergraduate Assembly had established committees parallel to the Faculty committees on the Course of Study and Undergraduate Life; student members were sitting with the committees on Admissions, the Library, the Course of Study, and Examinations and Standing, as well as on the Committee on Discipline (where this was established practice); and the undergraduate and Faculty committees on policy had met jointly on many occasions.

Students and the University had other important provisions. It declared that regulations governing the conduct of students "will be revised only after deliberations in which student representatives participate." It changed the composition of the Committee on Discipline to five student members (elected by the Undergraduate Assembly) and five members of the faculty, with the Dean of Students as Chairman. It codified certain provisions with regard

to disciplinary proceedings: Students who are alleged to have violated University regulations are to be informed in writing of the charges against them and have the right to speak on their own behalf, present witnesses in their favor, question witnesses against them, and receive a copy of the summary record of the proceedings. It made explicit rights that Princeton students have enjoyed customarily: Freedom of association, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and the right to assemble peaceably, to petition, and to invite speakers of their choice. It declared demonstrations permissible "unless, or until, they disrupt the regular and essential operations of the University or significantly infringe the rights of others." Finally, it stated that information from the records of alumni and students "is not to be disclosed (except to authorized University personnel, for internal use) to any person, organization, or agency without the consent of the individual to whom [such records] pertain."

A second important development in the governing of the University cannot be so precisely dated as the adoption of *Students and the University*, but it can be precisely described: Increasingly, major decisions are widely and openly debated before they are made, and, once they are made, the reasons for them are publicly explained. A brief account of the controversy over Princeton's investments in companies with affiliates in Southern Africa will make clear the procedures that have been followed.

In April, 1968, six students proposed that Princeton should henceforth invest no monies "in banks, companies, and other financial institutions which presently participate in the South African, Rhodesian, Angolan, and Mozambique economies," that it should divest itself of any holdings of companies participating in these economies, and that it should "refuse to accept monies, bequests, and endowments which come to the University primarily from the profits made in Southern Africa." In the late Spring, President Goheen, at the request of the Trustees, established a committee with members drawn from the faculty, Administration, and student body to examine this proposal. This committee met about once a week from September to November; many of its meetings were attended by other interested students and faculty members. The committee's members were not able to agree on a set of recommendations and in January, 1969, they issued three separate reports. All three were presented in a meeting open to all members

of the University community, were made easily available in the Library, and were referred by the President to the Faculty and the Undergraduate Assembly for discussion. In late January the Faculty endorsed the recommendations of one of the three reports (the Malkiel Report), requested the President to appoint a committee of students and faculty members to implement those recommendations, and went beyond the explicit recommendations of the Malkiel Report to urge that the University not hold securities in companies whose *primary* activities were in Southern Africa. In February the Undergraduate Assembly concurred in the Faculty's approval of the Malkiel Report and suggested in addition that the University not accept monies, bequests, and endowments *primarily* derived from profits made in Southern Africa. After further discussions with members of the United Front on South Africa, a student group formed to press for the adoption of the recommendations of one of the other reports (the Scott-Spight Report), and after another meeting of the Faculty, the President announced and explained his own position and that of the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees in a public meeting on March 4. His statement was at the same time distributed to students and members of the faculty and staff.

Some or all of the procedures used in the case just described—open meetings, appointment of study committees of students and faculty members, wide distribution of reports and other documents, referral of proposals to the Faculty and the Undergraduate Assembly, and direct talks between officers of the University and interested groups—were followed in arriving at many other decisions last year. In two instances, moreover, the Faculty and the Undergraduate Assembly acted in particularly close cooperation. They did so in developing rules for the conduct of open hearings in disciplinary proceedings and in arriving at a new statement of policy on protests and demonstrations that would be applicable to members of the faculty and staff as well as to students. In regard to both matters there were extensive efforts, in which the Faculty and undergraduate committees on policy played the major role, to bring the Faculty and U.G.A. into agreement.

The action taken on our proposal to establish the Council of the Princeton University Community was a third major development last year. We made that proposal in a report submitted in May; the Council held its first meeting on October 27, 1969, after the Undergraduate Assembly, the Faculty, the Staff Council, the

Professional Library Staff, and the Executive Committee of the Alumni Council had endorsed its Charter and elected representatives to it.[4]

When all its members are chosen,[5] the Council will be a body of fifty-seven members, including seven senior officers of the Administration; eighteen members of the Faculty; fourteen undergraduate students; eight graduate students; four alumni; one representative each from the Staff Council, the Professional Library Staff, the Professional Research Staff, the Professional Technical Staff, and the Office Staff; and one representative of members of the University staff not otherwise represented. It has authority to "consider and investigate any question of University policy, any aspect of the governing of the University, and any general issue related to the welfare of the University," and "to make recommendations regarding any such matters to the appropriate decision-making bodies of the University or to the appropriate officers of the University."[6] It also has authority to "make rules regarding the conduct of resident members of the University community," and to "oversee the making and applying of rules regarding the conduct of resident members of the University community."[7] Standing committees of the Council concern themselves with the University's budget, issues that arise in the course of preparing the budget, and plans for development; the adequacy of rules of conduct and of procedures for making and applying such rules; questions relating to the governing of the University; relations with the local community; investment policies; and the deciding of certain kinds of cases involving alleged violations of rules. One committee, the Committee on Governance, has an important consultative role in the selection of new Charter and Term Trustees and in the awarding of honorary degrees. The establishment of the Council and its committees brings a wide range of views to bear on the kinds of decisions we reviewed in our interim report and was proposed as a way to realize that objective.

An account of what has been happening to the government of Princeton, even a very brief account, would be inadequate if it

[4] In their meeting of June 4, 1969, the Trustees also endorsed in principle the proposal to establish the Council and indicated their intention "of co-operating and working closely with the Council."

[5] The graduate student body has not yet chosen representatives.

[6] See Appendix 7, p. 138 for the relevant provisions of the Council's Charter.

[7] *loc. cit.*

failed to note several important actions of the Board of Trustees. At its meeting in April, 1969, the Board delegated the authority for the formulation of social rules and standards for dormitory residents to the Faculty, with the understanding that the Faculty would in turn delegate this authority to the residents of dormitories.[8] At the same meeting the Trustees adopted a proposal of the Alumni Council providing for the election each year of a Trustee chosen by juniors, seniors, and the two classes most recently graduated, from among candidates nominated by the senior class.[9] In June the Board set the term of Charter Trustees, who had previously served until the age of seventy, at ten years; and, in approving in principle the establishment of the Council of the Princeton University Community, the Trustees also approved the proposal to choose new Charter and Term Trustees by a procedure that involves consultation with the Council's Committee on Governance. Finally, on October 24, 1969, the Board of Trustees adopted a Statement of Policy on Delegation of Authority in which it described in detail its own role in the governing of the University and declared its intent "in matters of policy as well as of operations, to continue to delegate broad authority to the President and, through him, to the Officers of the Administration, the Faculty, and the Students."

This report was written, and should be read, with all these developments in mind. We think further changes in the arrangements for governing Princeton are in order and recommend many such; the large number of recent changes, however, make it a good time also to take stock of Princeton's system of government as it now exists. For that reason, we have thought it important to describe and evaluate practices and institutions, both old and new, as well as to recommend change.

[8] Under the arrangements approved at that time the Faculty was to oversee the making and applying of rules regarding conduct in the dormitories, the Undergraduate Assembly was to define procedures for the making and applying of rules in dormitories mainly populated by undergraduates, and the rules were to be made by the residents of the dormitories themselves. With the establishment of the Council of the Princeton University Community, the Faculty's responsibility for oversight was further delegated to that body.

[9] The Alumni Council also proposed that, in 1969 only, a new Trustee be elected from the Class of 1968. The two Trustees elected in accordance with these arrangements, Brent L. Henry and Richard W. Cass, are now serving on the Board.

PART I

PROCEDURES FOR SETTING POLICY

THE organization of this report reflects the manner in which our study of the governing of the University proceeded. We first sought to reach conclusions about how and by whom particular kinds of policy decisions ought to be made; only then did we begin to consider systematically how the University might best organize itself for setting policies and what kinds of knowledge, means of communication, and administrative arrangements were needed to support the forms of organization we believed necessary and desirable. We adopted this procedure because we wanted to base our recommendations regarding the division of responsibilities within the University on an informed appreciation of what those responsibilities are for and of the context in which particular kinds of decisions must be made.

In this section we discuss the University's procedures for making decisions on some important and urgent kinds of policy issues: Procedures for decisions regarding the undergraduate and graduate courses of study, the appointment and advancement of members of the faculty, research contracts, the University's affiliations with other organizations and institutions, rules of conduct, and conflicts of interest. The section is not, however, a comprehensive survey of policy-making by the University, nor even of its setting of major policies. We do not discuss the making of decisions regarding the budget, development plans, or relations with the local community, because we have dealt with these subjects in earlier reports and have nothing to add to what we have already said about them.[10]

The Undergraduate Course of Study

While there have been some significant changes in the undergraduate curriculum at Princeton in the last two years, pressure is

[10] See our *Interim Report* (November 18, 1968), pp. 15-16, 20-25, and *A Proposal to Establish the Council of the Princeton University Community* (May, 1969), pp. 10-11.

great for still more change. Critics of the present course of study have raised serious questions about the grading system, the comprehensive examination, the degree and kind of specialization encouraged in the work of students, the adequacy of methods of instruction, the quality of academic counseling, distribution requirements, the language requirement, and the requirement of junior and senior independent work—and even this is not an exhaustive listing of such questions. Our interest as a committee has been in assessing the adequacy of procedures for settling issues of policy and not with the many policy issues themselves. Nonetheless, one thing is clear: There will be many issues to be settled.

At present the Faculty prescribes the undergraduate course of study, although other members of the University influence the character of the undergraduate curriculum in important ways. The Trustees are consulted in advance of any final decisions on proposals to establish new departments and programs and on any other proposals that involve substantial new claims on funds. The Administration sets limits on the kinds of work that departments may offer by the way it allocates funds. The President may suspend a department's usual powers; evidence that a department was neglectful of its undergraduate program could be a cause for doing so. Undergraduate students shape the curriculum offered them through their selections of courses, through the newly established program of student-initiated seminars, and, increasingly, through departmental committees and participation in committees of the Faculty.

The Faculty's influence on the undergraduate course of study is exercised by its individual members, the academic departments and programs, the Committee on the Course of Study, and the Faculty as a whole. Individual members of the faculty enjoy great freedom to interpret general rules, and they decide the content of courses, the manner in which they will present material, the kind of guidance they will give students' independent work, and the methods they will use to evaluate a student's mastery of a subject. Departments prescribe some aspects of the course of study for departmental majors, decide what courses are to be offered each term and the times that they will be offered (usually these decisions are made by the departmental chairman), propose new courses and programs, and, within limits, fix the nature of junior and senior independent work and the basis for awarding honors. The Faculty

Committee on the Course of Study may, on its own authority, approve the establishment of courses for a period of one year and changes in the descriptions of courses; for the rest, it reviews departmental recommendations on behalf of the Faculty as a whole and proposes changes in those features of the undergraduate course of study that are subject to change only by action of the Faculty as a whole. Such features include many requirements: Of the number and distribution of courses, independent work, competence in English composition and in a foreign language, the comprehensive examination, and physical education for freshmen. They include regulations for changes in candidacy for a degree, transfers, registration, grading, examinations, and probation. The Faculty as a whole also acts on all proposals for new courses and for the establishment of new departments and programs.

Two comments should be made on what has just been said. First, as should be evident, authority to make decisions regarding the undergraduate program at Princeton resides to a very large extent in the Faculty as a whole. Second, a description of the formal authority of the Faculty Committee on the Course of Study understates its actual influence on what is done. Departmental proposals are frequently changed on the advice of the Committee; and occasionally they are rejected by it. While departments have the right to appeal to the whole Faculty in the latter case, they have rarely done so.

In evaluating the arrangements just described, we have been primarily concerned with the roles that the academic departments, the Committee on the Course of Study, and undergraduate students should play in decisions about the undergraduate course of study. It is out of these concerns that the most serious questions about the present arrangements for making such decisions arise.

One such question involves the amount and kind of autonomy departments should have in making decisions about their undergraduate programs. There are a substantial number of students and faculty members who favor greater autonomy for the academic departments, although not all have the same objectives or the same reasons for their views. Some want to see the abolition or modification of some general requirement, for instance, of grading or of a thesis, at least for the undergraduate students in their

departments. Others seek to encourage innovation in the content of courses and the manner in which subjects can be studied.

Those who have the first objective raise important issues of educational policy as well as an issue of procedure. Indeed, the procedural issue cannot be settled without at the same time settling the issues of policy. If one argues that any department should be free to modify or abolish a general requirement *on its own authority*, one must have previously decided that no good case exists for the requirement being general. Because we could not have discussed the desirability of the present set of general requirements without delaying our report indefinitely, we have not as a committee reached any conclusions about the desirability of permitting departments to waive or modify some or all of such requirements for their majors.

We are strongly sympathetic to the desire for innovation in the content of courses and in their presentation. What is the best (or even a good) way to present a subject will vary with the talents of particular instructors, the attitudes of different groups of students, and the nature of the subject itself. What subjects are best to present will also vary, depending on the composition of the faculty at any particular time, the interests of the current group of students, developments in the different fields of knowledge, and the demand for particular kinds of knowledge and particular skills in society at large. It is right, therefore, to be suspicious of standardized methods of teaching and of procedures that make the changing of courses and teaching methods difficult.

What are the chief obstacles to more innovation in the content and presentation of courses at Princeton? The review of new courses and of changes in departmental programs by the Committee on the Course of Study could be such an obstacle if its members were inclined against change, but certainly it does not need to be. In the past, Committee members have rarely substituted their judgments of what is a good course or a good way of teaching for those of the academic departments, although they have criticized proposals from other points of view. Requirements of particular kinds of teaching methods are not among the obstacles to change. There is no rule, for example, that courses must involve lectures or preceptorials or a fixed number of meetings. Legally, so to speak, instructors and departments enjoy great freedom to change their ways of doing things. They may choose

not to make changes that they are free to make, however, because demands on the time of faculty members are heavy and innovation can be an exceedingly time-consuming activity. At any given time, also, many changes must be ruled out because they are too costly or because appropriate facilities for them do not exist or because the bringing together of students and teachers needs to be fitted into some kind of schedule.

While most of these constraints on change cannot be relaxed by altering procedures, in our judgment more could be done than is done now to encourage innovation in departmental programs and in teaching methods and to do so without creating new demands on resources. Since innovation involves substantial costs in time and energy, departments and faculty members must be given incentives to bear such costs if much innovation is to occur. These incentives would be greater than they are at present if departments were regularly permitted to apply savings in teaching time they may realize to enriching their undergraduate programs and to rewarding the efforts of instructors to develop new courses and methods of teaching.[11] Since budgeting procedures and teaching are currently under review by others, we will propose no precise formula for implementing this suggestion, nor do we want to convey the impression that we regard it as simple to implement. We do think, however, that it deserves serious consideration and a serious effort to work out the administrative problems that it involves.

What we have said so far about the role of the academic departments in decisions about the undergraduate curriculum forecasts our conclusion about the proper role of the Committee on

[11] To put this proposal in somewhat more specific terms, we think there would be more innovation in methods of instruction and in programs if:

(a) there were an understanding between the Administration and the departments that, in any given year, any economies realized by a department in the amount of teaching time required by its undergraduate program could be applied either to increasing the allotment of teaching time to its other undergraduate courses or to rewarding unusual efforts by instructors of undergraduate courses to work out new courses or methods of teaching; and

(b) there were an understanding between the Administration and the departments that *some* of the economies in teaching time required for its undergraduate program that were realized in one year might be applied in the next year either to rewarding efforts to innovate by the instructors of undergraduate courses or to enriching the department's undergraduate program.

the Course of Study. In our judgment, the Committee should continue to have its present responsibilities for initiating and reviewing proposals for change in the undergraduate curriculum and for seeing to it that the overall objectives of the undergraduate course of study are taken into account in such proposals. In exercising these responsibilities, it can serve as a useful check on the academic departments by asking them to clarify the nature and intent of proposals when that is in order. It should continue to be watchful of the interests of non-departmental students and of students in the inter-departmental programs. It can help to prevent needless duplication in the offerings of different departments. It is an indispensable aid to the Faculty as a whole in preparing proposals for Faculty action. Its work may need to be supplemented from time to time by that of special committees but that does not detract from the force of what has just been said.

We do recommend a modification in the charge of the Committee and one in the procedures for electing its members. In our view the Committee should be made responsible for monitoring experiments in teaching and for publicizing successful innovations.[12] A major objective of innovation in teaching should be to learn which methods work well and which do not and to make that knowledge widely available in the University community.

We also believe that at least four positions on the Course of Study Committee should be reserved for members of the non-tenured faculty. Any extended defense of a significant role for the junior faculty in deciding matters with regard to the undergraduate course of study should be unnecessary. Junior faculty members are heavily involved in the teaching of undergraduates, and they are a source of new ideas for ways to do it. Junior faculty members already participate in decisions about the undergraduate curriculum in the Faculty as a whole and in the academic departments. Assistant professors have had the vote in meetings of the Faculty for many years, and in virtually all departments important proposals for changes in the department's undergraduate curriculum go before the departmental faculty as a whole.[13] While non-tenured

[12] See Appendix 1, pp. 109-110 for the change in the charge of the Committee on the Course of Study that we suggest to implement this recommendation.

[13] In some departments lecturers and instructors are voting members of the departmental faculty; in others, they are not.

faculty members are now eligible to serve on the Committee on the Course of Study, they have in fact been greatly underrepresented among its members in recent years. As long as the present system for electing members of the Committee is retained, this situation is likely to continue, simply because junior faculty members are less well known than their colleagues of the senior faculty.[14]

The part that undergraduate students should play in decisions about the undergraduate course of study has been a recent subject of discussion and action at Princeton. Our own consideration of the issues this subject involves have been greatly influenced by that discussion and by the experience so far with the new institutions that arose out of it.

One premise on which the present arrangements for making decisions about the undergraduate curriculum is based can be simply stated: The parties most directly concerned with, and who know most about, the issues involved in such decisions are the faculty (including the academic officers of the University), on the one hand, and undergraduate students, on the other. We accept this premise, and, for that reason, we did not suggest the undergraduate course of study as a subject which the Council of the Princeton University Community would ordinarily discuss, even though, by the terms of its Charter, it might do so.

Both undergraduate students and faculty members have important contributions to make to the undergraduate curriculum, and both also, it should be acknowledged, have some deficiencies as participants in decisions about it. In the field of his professional competence, the faculty member knows the idiom in which knowledge is presented; he knows what questions have been answered and which have not; he is well acquainted with the methods by which answers can be found to questions and with the limitations of such methods. The faculty member, particularly the senior faculty member, has often had experience with many different approaches to learning and teaching and has informed judgments about which work well and which do not. He often knows better than his students what his students are capable of. He is relatively disinterested in his views on some issues about which a student finds it hard to be; on other issues, the faculty member, too, may

[14] See Appendix 1, pp. 105-106, 110 for the change we recommend in the procedures to elect members of the Committee on the Course of Study.

confuse convenience for himself with educational merit. He can be a captive of his experience as well as informed by it, and he may often fail to see that questions of great interest to him are not of great interest to others.

The undergraduate student knows a good deal, and sometimes more than his professors, about the actual working of current educational policy. He knows what he is interested in learning and what ways of presenting subjects have interested him. He may have fresh ideas about methods of study. He is a poor judge of the educational value of experiences he has not yet had, and he cannot easily adopt an unbiased view of the amount and quality of work that is reasonably expected of him.

The conclusion we have reached from this review of what undergraduate students and faculty members bring, or may bring, to decisions about the undergraduate course of study is this: The views of each should weigh differently in deciding different kinds of issues. For example, in decisions about the amount and quality of work to be required for the advancement of students, we would argue that students should not participate on equal terms with faculty members, just as we would argue that junior faculty members should not vote on decisions about the quality of work required for promotion or senior faculty members vote on decisions about their own salaries. When arrangements for advising students on academic matters are at issue, however, or when the kind of publicity to be given grades in courses is under consideration (for example, whether grades should be posted), the views of students should, in our judgment, weigh as heavily or more heavily than those of faculty members. Unfortunately, an issue-by-issue division of responsibility between the Faculty and undergraduate students for decisions about the undergraduate course of study would be almost impossibly complicated. On most of the issues that the construction of courses and a course of study gives rise to, we think the professional judgments of faculty members should count for more than those of their students. We therefore propose a set of arrangements that puts final authority for most decisions about the undergraduate course of study in the Faculty, but that is designed to give undergraduate students more influence than is implied by the right to be heard.

The set of procedures for involving students in decisions that was proposed in *Students and the University* and instituted last year has been our point of departure.

Most of the student departmental committees succeeded in being heard last year and many were successful in getting their proposals adopted. Virtually all departments reported one or more meetings between their committee of undergraduate students and the departmental faculty or representatives of it. Fifteen reported changes in their undergraduate programs that grew out of such meetings, among which were changes in courses, in the character of junior independent work, in the basis for awarding honors, in the nature of the comprehensive examination, and in the manner of organizing courses. Even when discussions did not result in changing the program of study, many were of the opinion that they had been valuable in elucidating the intent and consequences of present practices.[15]

Complaints about the performance of the committees came mainly from students. In our opinion, some of these did not indicate defects of the procedures so much as they did the critics' misconception of what could be done with the procedures. Members of some committees were frustrated in their reform efforts, for example, because they concentrated these in demands for changes that their departments had no authority to make. Others objected to the way "big concepts were broken down into bureaucratic details" when action on proposals was being considered. Unfortunately, action on any reform, large or small, requires asking precisely who must do what differently, if the reform is to be more than words on paper.

We do believe, however, that there are shortcomings in the new arrangements. The most important of these is their vagueness, which causes student committees and departmental faculties to have considerable difficulty in defining their relationships. Difficulties have arisen also from failure to locate responsibility within student groups and from the tendency of some student committees to act as advocates of their own ideas rather than as repre-

[15] The Chairman of the committee of undergraduate students in the Department of Sociology reported, for example: "The committee had found itself a sounding board for issues ranging from the extremely trivial to the impossibly broad and complex, and as a result, has actually *done* very little, outside of pure 'research' on issues. . . . I personally think the committee has been a valuable addition to the Department. It has stimulated interest among undergraduates in the Department and, as such, in their entire education. . . . The discussion and debate has involved just about everybody in the Department—faculty, graduate students, and undergraduates—and has made Green Hall quite exciting this year, even if very little has actually been accomplished."

sentatives of departmental majors. We think that these problems can be met and that what is needed to meet them is further specification of the rights of the student committees and of procedures for their selection and operation.

Students and the University provides that in departments of forty or more majors, the student departmental committee "will normally be made up of eight members; in smaller departments, it will normally have four members." These norms should be observed, or at least reasonably approximated. Even if meetings between departmental faculties and students are to be open to all majors to attend, as they have been in some departments, some few people need to accept responsibility for preparing an agenda, giving notice of meetings, and working out proposals in detail.

There is but one sentence in *Students and the University* regarding the election of student departmental committees: They are to be "elected in late spring of each academic year by and from among the prospective concentrators in the department." So little was said, undoubtedly, because what may be a reasonable set of procedures for a department with a hundred majors may be senseless formality in a department with ten. We will not suggest any one procedure for electing the student committees, but we do recommend that the student committees and departmental chairmen be made jointly responsible for adopting an election procedure that has these objectives: It should be convenient for majors to vote. There should be an opportunity for any major to place names in nomination. It should be difficult for an organized minority to capture a disproportionate share of committee positions and easy for relatively small groups of students to have *a* representative on their department's committee.[16] There should be reasonable precautions against multiple balloting by anyone and reasonable measures to insure a fair count of the vote.

Student departmental committees, according to *Students and*

[16] The election procedure known as the single transferable vote (see Appendix 13 where it is explained) accomplishes both the objectives just stated. For instance, in a department in which forty majors are to elect eight members to a committee, any six majors who agree upon a candidate cannot fail to elect him. The system would therefore permit small groups who are in easy and regular communication with each other to put one of their number on their department's committee. It would not permit so few as six students to elect any more than one representative (assuming all majors vote), as some alternative procedures might.

the University, are to "encourage students to participate in departmental affairs of special interest and relevance to them, to initiate proposals, and to seek discussion of any issue of general importance." This statement defines the charge of the committees very broadly, and so far none of them appear to have been hesitant to raise issues out of any concern that subjects might be out of bounds. It is a one-sided statement, however, because it lays no specific responsibility on departmental faculties to seek the views of their student committees on any subject. We think all proposals for changes in a department's undergraduate program that are to be acted upon by its faculty should be referred to its student committee in advance of faculty action. We recommend that departmental chairmen be responsible for doing so.

Students and the University provides that student committees "shall have at least one scheduled meeting each year" with their departmental faculties, and that "there shall be at least one additional meeting each year with the department's chairman or his designated representative." We think this an inadequate provision for consultation between departmental faculties and student committees. We recommend that the members of student committees be invited to discuss with departmental faculties any proposals for changes in the department's undergraduate program at, or before, any meetings in which a departmental faculty proposes to take action on such proposals. We recommend also that chairmen of departments be responsible for scheduling at least two meetings with their student committees: One early in the fall term in which plans for later consultation may be worked out, and one in late spring to review the department's undergraduate offerings so that chairmen may take the views of their student committees into account in preparing the requests for new staff to be submitted to the Dean of the Faculty the following October. We recommend further that student committees and faculty departmental committees concerned with the undergraduate program (in all departments in which the latter sort of committee exists) normally meet jointly.[17] Such joint meetings should save a considerable amount of time for both groups, avoid needless repetition of information and arguments, and help to prevent needless misunderstandings.

[17] We say "normally" because we do not mean to suggest that the student and faculty groups should not continue to have the right to meet separately.

Finally, we urge that student departmental committees have three additional prerogatives:

(1) The right to attach comments, favorable or unfavorable, to all proposals forwarded to the Committee on the Course of Study by a departmental faculty.
(2) A reasonable amount of secretarial and other assistance in preparing proposals, communicating with departmental majors, and conducting elections.
(3) The right in certain circumstances to secure a departmental faculty's reconsideration of action taken on proposals regarding the departmental course of study for undergraduate students.

This last proposal requires elucidation. Our specific suggestion is this: Departments should seriously consider a second vote on any measure regarding the department's undergraduate program, when it is requested by the student departmental committee. Departmental faculties should commit themselves to a second vote on such measures, if a second vote is requested by the student departmental committee in a petition endorsed by two-thirds of the department's majors. If the action being reconsidered is on a proposal that the departmental faculty has rejected, a majority vote of the departmental faculty should reverse the previous decision. If the action being reconsidered is on a proposal that has been adopted by the departmental faculty, a two-thirds vote of the departmental faculty should be required to affirm the previous decision. Departmental faculties should not be bound to reconsider the same action more than once in the same academic year.

Obviously, the procedure just outlined should not be invoked on small matters, and persistent and frivolous appeals to it would quite rightly lead to its abandonment. As a procedure for cases of serious disagreement on serious issues, however, it seems to us to be valid. A proposal supported by a very large majority of a department's majors should receive the most careful consideration. The procedure we recommend would guarantee that it did. An action taken over the objection of two-thirds of a department's majors should also carefully be considered, and, in our view, should not be allowed to stand if it can secure no more than bare-majority support of the faculty of a department. It should be allowed to

stand, however, if after the most careful consideration, the departmental faculty in a very substantial majority believes the action to be the right one.

In devoting so much space to discussing the role of student departmental committees, we have not meant to suggest that the interest of undergraduate students in their course of study is limited to those aspects of it that are prescribed by departments. On the contrary, students have a legitimate and active concern about many matters regarding the undergraduate curriculum that are subject to change only by the action of the Faculty as a whole. The Undergraduate Assembly is the chief instrument now available to students for use in pursuing these extra-departmental interests; it has been a valuable instrument, but it can also be, in our opinion, a better one.

At present the Undergraduate Assembly appoints two students to sit with the Faculty's Committee on the Course of Study, and a subcommittee of the U.G.A.'s Academic Committee has the right to meet with the Faculty Committee at least once a year. We regard this arrangement as unnecessarily cumbersome. We see no reason why the U.G.A. Subcommittee should not normally meet jointly with the Faculty Committee on the Course of Study, so long as the Subcommittee is maintained at about its present size (five members). Five students sitting with the Faculty Committee should be better able to represent a range of student opinion than two, and the "at least once a year" meeting could be dispensed with. When meeting jointly with the Faculty Committee on the Course of Study, members of the U.G.A.'s Subcommittee should have the same privileges that students who sit with the Committee now enjoy.[18] In addition, we would give the U.G.A.'s Subcommittee the right to attach comments, favorable or unfavorable, to any proposals forwarded to the Faculty by the Course of Study Committee and to appear at meetings of the Faculty to present the views of the Subcommittee on such proposals.[19]

[18] According to *Students and the University*, "The student representatives on faculty committees shall join freely in committee discussions of matters of concern to students, and shall be responsible for presenting the view of the . . . Undergraduate Assembly, when those are known. Any student participating in the deliberations of a faculty committee is bound by the same rules as the faculty regarding the confidential nature of the proceedings. Within the bounds of this restriction, he may discuss the matters under consideration with the Undergraduate Assembly or with other students."

[19] When the Course of Study Committee and the U.G.A. Subcommittee

We also recommend that the Undergraduate Assembly have the right under certain conditions to obtain a second vote by the Faculty on any decision made with regard to the undergraduate course of study. Specifically: The Faculty should seriously consider a second vote on any decision it has made about the undergraduate curriculum when a second vote is requested by the Undergraduate Assembly. The Faculty should commit itself to a second vote on a decision about the undergraduate curriculum, if a second vote has been requested by a two-thirds majority of the Undergraduate Assembly. If the action being reconsidered is on a proposal that the Faculty has rejected, a majority vote of the Faculty should reverse the previous decision. If the action being reconsidered is on a proposal that has been adopted by the Faculty, a two-thirds vote of the Faculty should be necessary to affirm the previous decision. The Faculty should not be requested to reconsider the same action more than once in any academic year. This procedure is, of course, virtually identical to that which we suggested should be available to student departmental committees, and our reasons for believing it a good procedure are the same.

Before passing to other subjects, one final comment is in order on the new arrangements we propose for involving undergraduate students in the making of decisions about their course of study. These procedures could easily fail to work well if either students or faculty members should forget a point we made earlier: That the validity of their respective claims for the authority of their views will vary from issue to issue. Our faith in their good sense is strong enough to make us think that they can work within the new arrangements while bearing that point in mind, and we advance our recommendations with confidence that they will do so.

Graduate Courses of Study

The arrangements for making decisions about the various courses of study for graduate students are formally very similar to those for making decisions about the undergraduate curriculum. The Faculty has final responsibility for most decisions about graduate programs. Departments decide what courses and seminars

---

meet jointly, we think that votes in the two groups should be recorded separately but that the count in both should be recorded for the information of the Faculty and the Undergraduate Assembly.

will be offered each term, fix the nature and content of the General Examination, and prescribe many incidental features of the student's course of study. In most departments, a departmental committee considers proposals for changes in the department's graduate program, referring important matters to the full departmental faculty for decision.[20] The Faculty Committee on the Graduate School (which is chaired by the Dean of the Graduate School and includes one member from each of the academic departments and programs) considers proposals for new courses or seminars, new programs, substantial revisions in old programs, and revisions in University requirements for the various degrees. The Committee then presents recommendations for action on such matters to the Faculty as a whole.

Despite these similarities in formal arrangements for making decisions about the academic programs of graduate and undergraduate students, the actual balance of influences differs considerably. Because a graduate student's education is education for a profession, his program of study is much more completely shaped by his department than is that of the undergraduate student. Moreover, graduate students are not organized, as undergraduate students are, to initiate proposals or to express their views regarding their courses of study. No University-wide organization of graduate students exists. In more than half the departments graduate students have an organization of sorts, but in most it is a very loose organization that has played no important part in facilitating participation by graduate students in decisions about their education.

We regard the lack of regular procedures for communication between graduate students and faculty members on matters pertaining to the education of graduate students to be the most serious shortcoming in the current arrangements for making decisions about the graduate curriculum. We are convinced that an educational program that is worked out after an active exchange of views between students and faculty members is more likely to be a good program than one that is not. Like the undergraduate student, the graduate student has important contributions to make to discus-

[20] One department reported to us that only the tenured members of its faculty voted on proposals for changes in its graduate program. Three additional departments reported that such decisions were made by those members of its faculty who teach graduate courses or seminars.

sions of educational policy and practice. He also has something to learn from such discussions that is of practical value to himself, since most graduate students at Princeton will themselves soon be participating as faculty members in discussions on curriculum.

Participation by graduate students in decisions about curriculum can involve the whole body of a department's graduate students or be carried on through representatives. Two years ago the Department of Economics made extensive revisions in its graduate program. Substantially all of the graduate students of the Department participated in making these revisions in an informal but highly effective way. In preparation for a general meeting of the Department's faculty and graduate students, the Department's Graduate Representative[21] asked the officers of the Graduate Economics Club to prepare and distribute a questionnaire soliciting the views of the Department's graduate students on virtually all aspects of the graduate program in Economics.[22] The Club's officers agreed to do so, collected the completed questionnaires, and summarized the responses. The Graduate Representative reported these responses to the general meeting, and the minutes of the discussion that followed became the basis of a paper proposing reforms in the Department's graduate program. Students and faculty members discussed this paper at a second general meeting, and, when another questionnaire showed that graduate students overwhelmingly approved the reforms proposed, the Department's faculty adopted them. Revisions in the program involved adding new courses, eliminating old ones, and changing the content and sequences of courses. The Department made these revisions because the responses to the first questionnaire and the ensuing discussions had made it clear there was extensive duplication of subject matter in the Department's offerings and a lack of coherence in the treatment of some fields of study. The contribution that graduate students can make to such a discovery should be evident,

[21] We note for the benefit of undergraduate readers that a Graduate Representative is a member of a departmental faculty who administers its graduate program and represents the department in meetings of the Faculty Committee of the Graduate School.

[22] Graduate students were asked about the need for new courses, the desirability of revising current courses, the integration of courses, grading policies, the adequacy of training in mathematics and in the use of quantitative methods of analysis, the content and conduct of the General Examination, the handling of particular subjects and fields of study, the adequacy of fellowships, and relations with members of the faculty.

since a graduate student participates in a large number of his department's seminars, while a faculty member rarely participates in any but his own.

The Woodrow Wilson School's graduate students participate regularly and formally in the making of decisions about their program of study through elected representatives. The School's Curriculum Committee, established in the fall of 1968, includes four students, four members of the faculty, and the Director of the Graduate Program. It is responsible for considering proposals for changes in course requirements, the structure of courses, the language requirement, the General Examination, and requirements for the M.P.A. and Ph.D. degrees. The Committee's recommendations go to the faculty of the School for review or approval. Curricular Subcommittees with faculty and student members and co-chairmen also exist in each of the major fields of the School's course of study. Although there are some complaints about them, these arrangements appear to be generally well regarded by the School's students and faculty.[23]

At the departmental level Princeton graduate students need not choose between general participation in the making of decisions and participation through representatives. For major revisions of a graduate program like that undertaken in Economics, general meetings of graduate students and faculty members are both useful and feasible. Except in the very smallest departments, elected committees of graduate students are also highly desirable to help in organizing general meetings, working out proposals in detail, and maintaining liaison with the departmental faculty.

We therefore recommend that all departments establish departmental committees of graduate students. These committees should be relatively small and should be chosen in a manner that will

[23] The Associate Director of the School's graduate program reported to us that: "For several years, faculty members concerned with particular fields of concentration, or with overall School policy, have met with student committees; and discussions on the organization of the fields, on problems with particular courses, on the language examination, and other matters continue throughout the year. Undoubtedly, some students believe that useful changes at times evolve more slowly than they should; some faculty members also hold this view at times. My own impression is that the structure of the curriculum, what courses are taught, and other matters of School policy have been influenced substantially by the views of the graduate student body. The formal merger of the faculty and student committees since January should increase this influence."

insure a variety of points of view in their memberships. They should have the same prerogatives as departmental committees of undergraduate students, since the basic issues raised by the participation of the two groups of students in decisions on curriculum differ in no essential way,[24] even though the educational aims and interests of graduate and undergraduate students do. The committee of graduate students should normally meet with the committee of the departmental faculty concerned with graduate studies, if one exists. The student committee should have the right to initiate discussion of any proposals relating to the departmental graduate program, and proposals initiated by others should be routinely referred to it for comment or criticism prior to any final action on them by the departmental faculty. Members of the student committee should be invited to participate in any discussions of the graduate curriculum at departmental meetings; be able to attach comments to any proposals forwarded by their department to the Committee on the Graduate School; and have the right to secure a second vote by the departmental faculty on issues regarding the graduate curriculum.[25] In all of these activities the departmental committee of graduate students should act as a liaison between the departmental faculty and the graduate student body of the department; committee members should therefore be responsible for keeping their fellow graduate students informed of issues before the department and should receive the secretarial and other assistance necessary to do so.

Since some important decisions regarding the graduate curriculum are made by the Faculty as a whole, we think that there should also be regular communication between the University's graduate student body, on the one hand, and the Dean of the Graduate School, the Faculty Committee on the Graduate School, and the Faculty, on the other. The best arrangement for that purpose would be a University-wide organization of graduate students, and, at a later point in this report,[26] we will make specific recom-

[24] For that reason, we will not repeat our discussion of those issues here. See pp. 15-16 above.

[25] In saying that departmental committees of graduate students should have the same prerogatives as those of departmental committees of undergraduate students, we meant ourselves to be taken literally. In what has just been said, those prerogatives have been only roughly suggested; they are precisely described on pp. 18-21 above.

[26] See pp. 86-88 below.

mendations for the establishment of such an organization. Here we will note only that, in our judgment, a properly constituted University-wide organization of graduate students should have the same rights of intervention in matters regarding the various graduate courses of study as those we think proper for the Undergraduate Assembly in matters regarding the undergraduate curriculum:[27] These would include the right to attach comments to proposals regarding the graduate courses of study being forwarded to the Faculty, the right to send representatives to meetings of the Faculty to speak for or against proposals, and the right, upon a two-thirds vote of its members, to obtain a second vote by the Faculty on any decision about the graduate curriculum.

The Appointment and Advancement of Faculty Members

Few decisions of a university ramify more widely than those regarding the appointment and advancement of members of its faculty. Directly, such decisions commit a large part of a university's budget, determine to a very large extent the character and quality of its courses of study, and increase or decrease its ability to attract new faculty members and to keep current ones. Less directly, such decisions have consequences for the extent and nature of many university activities, from the purchase of books for the library to the building of new laboratories and offices.

An account of decisions on the appointment and advancement of faculty members at Princeton can conveniently begin with a discussion of some important actions taken in November and December. At that time the chief officers of the University decide the amount of money which they judge can be set aside for faculty salaries in the next academic year, authorize the academic departments to propose candidates for a specified number of faculty positions at specified ranks, and allocate funds for salary increases to departments, indicating the way such funds are to be distributed among the different ranks.[28] Statements from the de-

[27] See pp. 21-22 above. Once again, the rights as we envision them are described more precisely there.

[28] The President, the Provost, the Dean of the Faculty, and the Financial Vice-President and Treasurer are the officers mainly involved. Now that the Priorities Committee of the Council of the Princeton University Community has been established, the basic issues are discussed with this group before decisions are made.

partments, trends in course enrollments, estimates of income, and a number of general considerations of policy[29] guide the Administration in these decisions. The decisions are reviewed by the Board of Trustees for their financial feasibility and for their policy implications.

It should be noted that the decisions just discussed do *not* concern the appointment and advancement of particular members of the faculty, the subject which is our major concern here. At present the major participants in decisions of this latter sort are the academic departments, the academic officers of the University, and the Faculty Advisory Committee on Appointments and Advancements.

The departments originate virtually all proposals regarding the appointment, reappointment, promotion, and salaries of faculty members. Participation in the making of these recommendations varies with the nature of the recommendation, the rank of the person it concerns, and the department making it. Table I indicates the norms for participation prescribed by the Faculty.[30] In the past these and similar norms have usually been regarded as statements about who must be consulted, not who may be, and in many departments both formal and informal consultation on some kinds of recommendations is wider than required. In seven departments, for example, all members of the departmental faculty participate in recommending candidates for new appointments, regardless of the rank at which the appointment is to be made; in six others, those who hold the rank at which an appointment is to be made, as well as those of superior rank, vote on the recommendation of candidates.

Departmental chairmen forward in writing all recommendations of the sorts just discussed to the Dean of the Faculty for transmission to the President. Most proposals regarding reappointments, promotions, and salary changes are made in December; most new appointments are recommended in a period running from mid-November until the end of March. As Table II indicates, the President and the Dean of the Faculty take what is effectively final action on recommendations for initial appoint-

[29] Maintaining salaries that are competitive with other institutions of higher learning, keeping a reasonable balance between the numbers of tenured and non-tenured faculty members, and developing new programs of instruction are among such considerations.

[30] As of June 3, 1969.

TABLE I

PARTICIPATION IN DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE APPOINTMENT AND ADVANCEMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY*

Source of Recommendation:	*Recommendations Regarding:*
The Departmental Chairman	–Changes in the salaries of professors. –Appointments and reappointments of instructors and assistants in instruction, and changes in the salaries of instructors.
The Professors of the Department	–Appointments of professors –Promotions to the rank of professor –Appointments and reappointments of associate professors –Salaries of associate professors
The Professors and Associate Professors of the Department	–Promotions to the rank of associate professor –Appointments and reappointments of assistant professors –Changes in the salaries of assistant professors –Appointments and reappointments of lecturers –Changes in the salaries of lecturers

* Norms prescribed in the *Rules and Procedures of the Faculty*.

ments of assistant professors and all proposals concerning instructors and assistants in instruction. Almost all other proposals are acted upon by the President in consultation with the Faculty Advisory Committee on Appointments and Advancements.[31]

[31] Occasionally, a decision must be made regarding a faculty member's promotion or salary at a time (during the summer months, for instance) when it is not practicable to convene the Advisory Committee on Appoint-

TABLE II

ACTIONS ON RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE APPOINTMENT AND ADVANCEMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY*

By the President and the Dean of the Faculty:	*By the President and the Faculty Advisory Committee on Appointments and Advancements:*
–Appointments of assistant professors, instructors, and assistants in instruction	–Appointments of professors and associate professors
–Reappointment of instructors and assistants in instruction	–Reappointments of assistant professors and associate professors
–Salary changes for instructors	–Promotions of assistant professors and associate professors
	–Salary changes for all professorial ranks

* Subject to review by the Board of Trustees.

This Committee, historically and respectfully known as "The Committee of Three," has four members who are elected by the Faculty from among the chairmen of the departments in each Division of the University. The Committee normally meets with the President, the Provost, the Dean of the Faculty, the Dean of the Graduate School, and the Dean of the College to consider action on all the kinds of recommendations listed in the right-hand column of Table II. In all cases, the Committee and the academic officers who meet with it have before them statements from the departments justifying recommendations. When promotions to tenure are being considered (and in some other cases) they will have the advice of professionally qualified outsiders as well. The Committee may advise the rejection of departmental recommendations or changes in them, and does so often enough to avoid any allegation that its review of recommendations is *pro forma*. If there is a vote taken, the votes of the elected members decide the Com-

ments and Advancements. In these circumstances the decision is made by the President (or, in his absence, the Provost) after consultation with the Dean of the Faculty and with such other academic officers or committee members as may be available.

mittee's position, but formal calls for votes are infrequent. As its name suggests, the Committee is advisory to the President, but instances in which its advice has not been taken have been rare.

All proposals for the appointment and advancement of faculty members, both those approved by the President on his own authority and those approved by the President and the Advisory Committee on Appointments and Advancements, are presented to the Curriculum Committee of the Board of Trustees and to the full Board for review. Board members often ask questions about particular appointments or about the whole set of proposals. For many years, however, the Board has chosen not to act on individual cases; it exercises its responsibility for the election of faculty members instead by assessing the President's success in maintaining a highly qualified faculty and by giving continuing attention to the efficiency and integrity of the procedures for appointment and advancement.

Review by the Board of Trustees on proposals for appointment and advancement constitutes final action on them in all but one circumstance: Any member of the faculty who considers himself to have been treated unfairly in relation to "appointment, reappointment, or academic duties or privileges" is entitled to a review of his case by the Faculty's Committee on Conference, and, if that Committee so requests, by a subcommittee of the Board of Trustees. Since the establishment of the Council of the Princeton University Community, he has the further right to request a review by the Council's Judicial Committee of the procedures adopted by the Conference Committee in the consideration of his case. No member of the faculty has invoked his right to a review by the Committee on Conference of action on his appointment or advancement since that right was established in 1959.[32]

What are the objectives of the rather complicated set of procedures just described? Most members of the University community would hold that they are, and should be, the following: (1) To appoint and retain highly qualified faculty members, whatever their specialties; (2) to appoint and retain faculty members highly qualified in particular branches of learning; (3) to avoid

[32] A faculty member who is either dismissed or suspended also has the right to a hearing by the Committee on Conference of the Faculty and, before any final adverse action, by that Committee and a committee of the Board of Trustees jointly.

arbitrary or prejudiced judgments of any faculty member's claims to appointment or advancement; (4) to avoid the appearance of arbitrary or prejudiced judgments of any faculty member's claims to appointment or advancement; and (5) to realize these objectives with minimum costs in time and energy.

Princeton has for a long time regarded both good teaching and good scholarship as essential qualifications for appointment to, and advancement in, its faculty; ability to contribute in other ways—by service on University or departmental committees or in administrative posts, for example—has also been given consideration, although not primary consideration. These traditional criteria for assessing the qualifications of faculty members are in our judgment the ones that should be applied at Princeton, and that they are to be applied should be more clearly stated in the *Rules and Procedures of the Faculty* than is the case at present.[33] It seems obvious that an ability to teach well should be essential for appointment as a teacher. It seems clear also that ability as a scholar should not only be valued for its own sake but should be required of anyone who is to teach advanced students in a discipline. That Princeton should as a matter of policy expect each member of its faculty to be well qualified to teach both graduate and undergraduate students is perhaps not so obvious: It would be possible to appoint two faculties, one for each of the two groups of students. Where that has been done, however, there is a strong tendency for the teachers of undergraduates to be regarded as a second-class faculty both by themselves and others, with the consequence that recruiting and keeping able teachers for undergraduate students becomes more difficult than it has been at Princeton. Thus, our endorsement of the present criteria for the appointment and advancement of faculty members is also an endorsement of Princeton's traditional policy of maintaining one faculty for both its graduate and undergraduate courses of study. We endorse as well the present practice of giving consideration to administrative service, and to other kinds of service in the University community, in decisions on the appointment, reappointment, promotion, and salaries of members of the faculty.[34] Princeton relies heavily on its

[33] For the change in the rules of the Faculty that we suggest to implement this recommendation, see Appendix 1, pp. 100-102.

[34] See Appendix 1, pp. 101-102 where we suggest a change in the *Rules and Procedures of the Faculty* to make this policy an explicit one.

faculty members for such service, the demand for it is increasing, and it ought to be properly rewarded.

Existing procedures give to departmental faculties the major active role in decisions on the appointment and advancement of faculty members; the academic officers or the Committee on Appointments and Advancements may question and sometimes reject or modify departmental proposals, but they rarely act in the absence of them. Why departmental faculties should have the initiative in decisions of this kind is evident if one considers the kind of judgments involved. To make such decisions is to make estimates of the quality of a faculty member's (or a prospective faculty member's) scholarship; of the quality of his teaching of both graduate and undergraduate students; of his promise as a teacher and a scholar; of the likely future importance of his field of scholarship; of his abilities as they compare with those who might replace him; and of the balance of talents required in a department. Professional knowledge, experience in teaching, acquaintance with the full scope of a department's activities, or all three, are essential if most of these estimates are to be made well, and, in the normal case, departmental faculties are in a better position than anyone else to provide this kind of expertise.

We think that participation within departmental faculties in decisions on appointments and advancements should be as inclusive as it can be without making any faculty member a judge in his own case or in that of anyone directly in competition with him. The wider the participation in such decisions, the better the information that is likely to be brought to bear on them and the more likely are prejudices to cancel out. Given this perspective, we have no fundamental quarrel with the present norms for participation in departmental recommendations regarding appointments and advancements, although we do favor one change in them. Associate professors are normally consulted in decisions on promotions to the rank of associate professor but need not be in decisions on appointments to that rank. There would seem to be no reason to distinguish these cases and none, therefore, for failing to make the consultation of associate professors in the latter sort of decision a regular procedure.[35] We also urge (but would not require) departments to broaden participation in decisions on the

[35] See Appendix 1, p. 101 for the change we suggest in the *Rules and Procedures of the Faculty* to implement this recommendation.

appointment and advancement of instructors, and to consult assistant professors informally on appointments and promotions to that rank, when that does not involve an assistant professor in a decision about someone in competition with himself.

Until very recently, Princeton's procedures for making decisions on the appointment and advancement of faculty members made inadequate provision for the evaluation of teaching.[36] If performance in teaching is to be important in such decisions in fact and not just in theory, one needs information sufficient in quality and amount to enable one to assess performance in teaching with some confidence. In the past, departmental faculties frequently have not had that kind of information. They have been forced to rely far too heavily on data concerning course enrollments, on intuition, and on haphazardly collected hearsay evidence.

Students are not the only source of information about the quality of teaching, but they are an important source of such information, and they should be fully and systematically consulted in this regard. The course-by-course evaluations of teaching by undergraduate students that were instituted last year are an important first step in that direction. In our view the information they provide should be supplemented at the earliest practicable date with that from similar evaluations of teaching by graduate students, and with that obtained in direct consultations of representative groups of both graduate and undergraduate students.

We therefore recommend:

(1) That the Dean of the Graduate School assume responsibility for developing procedures to survey the views of graduate students on the quality of their instruction;

(2) That, at least once each year, departmental chairmen invite the student departmental committees of their departments, both graduate and undergraduate, to express their views on the quality of instruction in their departments and on any other matters relevant to the appointment and advancement of faculty members; and

[36] Both in our opinion and in that of many other members of the University community. Surveys of opinion sponsored by our Committee found that 52 per cent of the undergraduate students responding, 53 per cent of the graduate students, and 70 per cent of the faculty members, rated Princeton's procedures for evaluating teaching as either "fair" or "poor." The surveys were taken before provision was made for the evaluation of courses by undergraduate students.

(3) That departmental committees of students, both graduate and undergraduate, be regularly invited by departmental chairmen to forward to the Dean of the Faculty for transmission to the President (and where appropriate, to the Faculty Advisory Committee on Appointments and Advancements) comments regarding the quality of teaching by individual members of the faculty.

The consultation of student committees by departmental chairmen just proposed would, in our judgment, best be scheduled for the spring of each year; that would permit discussions of the quality of instruction to take place in the context of the discussions of departmental needs for new staff that we have already suggested.[37]

The legitimacy of the interest of students in the definition of new staff positions is evident. To make it more certain that their preferences are taken into account when new appointments are defined in terms of particular academic specialties, we propose:

(1) That departmental committees of students, both graduate and undergraduate, be regularly invited by departmental chairmen to attach comments to any requests for the authorization of new staff positions being forwarded by their departments to the Dean of the Faculty;

(2) That the Dean of the Faculty—working with the Dean of the College, the Committee on the Course of Study, and the Academic Committee of the Undergraduate Assembly—seek to devise regular ways to make a limited number of extra-departmental appointments of limited term.

We make this last recommendation because we believe that responsibility for recommending new appointments is at present too exclusively departmental fully to satisfy needs for staff for the undergraduate course of study. In seeking new faculty, departments are apt to be biased in favor of persons whose attachment to an academic discipline is unequivocal; such persons are by no means the only kind who may contribute as teachers of undergraduate students. The intent of the proposal is not to open the way for the building of a separate faculty for the undergraduate curriculum, however; to avoid that possibility, we have specified that extra-departmental appointments be limited in number and for limited terms.

In considering the fairness of Princeton's procedures for mak-

[37] See p. 19 above.

ing decisions on appointments and advancements, the confidentiality of the discussions of bodies making such decisions deserves comment. Openness of proceedings is one way both to keep them fair and to build a general confidence in their fairness; that, certainly, is a large part of the case for making the proceedings of courts open to public scrutiny. As applied to the kinds of proceedings we have been concerned with here, however, we think the case for openness must be rejected. It would in some instances involve a severe infringement of the right to privacy of faculty members. For example, facts concerning the health of a faculty member may be legitimately introduced into a discussion of his reappointment or promotion, if they help to account for his professional conduct and are necessary to forming judgments about his professional conduct in the future. The same facts are not legitimate topics of public discussion by a university's officers or faculty. Moreover, for good or ill, *public* discussion of a man's professional qualifications is carried on in accordance with conventions very different from those which govern discussion of professional qualifications when decisions on employment are being made. A comment that will be regarded as only mildly negative in the latter context is likely to be taken as damning if said publicly. We are strongly of the opinion, therefore, that the confidentiality of the proceedings of bodies considering appointments and advancements should be maintained.

Apart from the possible disadvantages of such confidentiality, the faculty member's interest in having his claims to appointment and advancement evaluated fairly has very substantial protection at Princeton. Wide participation in departmental recommendations; the exclusion of those with directly competing interests from participation in decisions; review of decisions by the President, the Committee on Appointments and Advancements, and the Board of Trustees; the right to appeal a decision to the Faculty Committee on Conference; the right to raise questions about the procedures of the Conference Committee before the Judicial Committee of the Council of the Princeton University Community—all these features of present procedures serve to reduce the likelihood of arbitrary or prejudiced decisions, and some of the measures we have thus far recommended would reduce it still further. Since the University's interest in the integrity of its procedures for appointment

and advancement is a very important one, however, we do not hesitate to recommend two additional measures.

First, we would enlarge the membership of the Committee on Conference to nine, and reserve three positions on the Committee for members of the non-tenured faculty.[38] In the last five years, no member of the junior faculty has served on the Conference Committee, despite formal eligibility to do so. Given the Committee's responsibilities, there should be active spokesmen for the interests of the non-tenured faculty among its members.

Second, we think the Administration should seek to ascertain in a systematic way the views of non-tenured faculty members on the manner in which decisions on appointments and advancements are made in their respective departments. A fairly simple questionnaire administered by the Dean of the Faculty should be sufficient for this purpose. If a department's handling of appointments and advancements is unfair or unwise in the opinion of its non-tenured members, that fact should be known to the Administration. Junior faculty members may now take grievances to the Dean of the Faculty, but few are likely to do it unless their grievances are both great and personal. The Administration may also learn of discontent in a department's non-tenured faculty from members of the senior faculty, but there is no need to rely wholly on this source of information, when the views of the non-tenured faculty can be solicited directly.

The Sponsorship of Research

Princeton's more than five hundred grants and contracts for research account for about $30,000,000 of its yearly income and expenditures, of which the largest part by far (about $29,000,000) is attributable to contracts with agencies of the federal government, or grants from such agencies. Contracts and grants pay for the wages, salaries, and stipends of 1,200 to 1,400 members of the University community.[39]

While contracts for research have not been a subject of major

[38] See Appendix 1, p. 109 for the change we recommend in the procedure to elect members of the Committee on Conference.

[39] A rough estimate of the number of graduate students and members of the faculty, Professional Research Staff, Professional Technical Staff, and Shop and Laboratory Staff whose work would be supported full time by grants and contracts.

controversy at Princeton, the experience of other universities amply attests to their potential for controversiality. Research contracts and grants necessarily involve an extensive set of relationships with other institutions. At any time, regulating these relationships would confront Princeton with difficult issues of policy; in recent years such issues have become even more difficult, because particular involvements are seen by many as implying that the University has taken a position on highly charged social and political questions.

The present arrangements governing the solicitation and acceptance of research contracts are described in detail in the *Rules and Procedures of the Faculty*. In all cases in which the University is to administer funds, contracts for research must conform to certain general policies. Princeton is not to enter contracts, for example, if they extend the research activities of a department to the detriment of graduate or undergraduate education. Any research undertaken must promise a significant contribution to basic knowledge. The University is not to administer funds for projects whose purpose and sponsorship cannot be publicly disclosed. It is to accept contracts for research that give rise to classified information only under very exceptional circumstances, and there have in fact been no such contracts accepted since 1958. Proposals for research involving human subjects are to be examined with a view to protecting the rights and interests of subjects. The indirect costs charged to research contracts are to be high enough to enable the University to sponsor research without prejudice to its other programs.

Since 1959 the University Research Board has had primary responsibility for formulating and implementing policies of this kind.[40] It also routinely reviews proposals for new contracts, when these involve yearly budgets of $25,000 or more, and others, when any question exists concerning their consistency with established policies or when they have "broad or unusual implications." Proposals not reviewed by the Board are reviewed by its administrative arm, the Office of Research and Project Administration.

In our view the University Research Board has been an exceedingly valuable instrument for bringing uniform and well considered policies to the sponsoring of research and to involvements

[40] From 1946 to 1959, the Committee on Project Research and Inventions had similar responsibilities.

with the sponsors of research. Its charge is broad enough to permit it to consider almost any issue that might arise in connection with a research project, and its procedures help to insure that practice will conform to policy. Nonetheless, as a body to develop policies, the Board has one potential weakness that we find a cause for concern.

That weakness lies in the present composition of its membership. Only the Administration and the Faculty are now represented on the Board, and Faculty representation is preponderantly from the physical sciences and engineering. This is not unreasonable, when one considers the full range of things the Board does, for the bulk of Princeton's sponsored research is in engineering and the physical sciences and many of the matters with which it deals are administrative and technical in nature. Because its membership is unrepresentative of the University community as a whole, however, it is possible that questions of concern to substantial segments of that community may on some occasions fail to get the Board's attention.

For this reason, we think that the Research Board's responsibility for developing policies for sponsored research should be shared with a body more representative of the University community as a whole, specifically with the Council of the Princeton University Community. The two groups should coordinate their work and, to facilitate such coordination, we would have the Chairman of the Research Board report to the Council from time to time on the policy issues before the Board. We would also have the Board's Chairman refer all proposals for research that involve novel issues of policy to the Executive Committee of the Council, for its independent consideration of them.[41] With a membership and a charge broader than the Board's, it should be a valuable additional source of advice to the President in such cases.

Affiliations with Organizations, the Leasing of Campus Property

Princeton University is a member of, or has close affiliation with, over one hundred other organizations and institutions. The names of a few of these—the Association of American Universi-

[41] See Appendix 1, pp. 114-115 for the changes in the charge of the Research Board that we suggest to implement these recommendations.

ties, the Inter-Collegiate Center for Classical Studies in Italy, Associated Universities, Inc. (Brookhaven Laboratories), the Council on Graduate Education in Public Administration, the Center for Research Libraries, the National College Athletic Association—are sufficient to show their great variety.

Until 1968 the University had no formal procedures for reviewing such affiliations and no explicit general policies regarding them. In some instances at least, Princeton joined organizations on the urging of a few members of the Faculty or Administration, if informal consultation suggested no problems. While in most cases such associations probably benefited Princeton and others, decisions made in that way tended to give too much influence to the opinions of the proponents of an involvement and too little influence to the views of other members of the University community.

One consequence of the controversy over Princeton's relations with the Institute for Defense Analyses was a resolution of the Faculty in March, 1968 (which was endorsed by the Undergraduate Assembly in May), calling for referral to one of the standing committees of the Faculty of all new proposals to join organizations or to lease campus property.[42] In our interim report we expressed approval of this procedure as a step in the right direction but argued that the responsibility for reviewing leases of campus property and memberships in organizations might better be located in a group representative of the whole University community. Such associations commit the good name of Princeton, and they may, therefore, be a matter of concern to any member of the University community. Moreover, the issues that arise in making judgments about such associations are not primarily technical or professional. They involve, rather, rough estimates of potential benefits and costs, and such estimates are likely to be better made when a particular association is considered from many different points of view.

[42] Specifically, the resolution declared that "leases of campus property to outside agencies, and the renewal of such leases, should be referred for advance review to an appropriate standing committee of the Faculty, and, at the discretion of such a committee, to the Faculty as a whole," and "proposals for Princeton to join an organization, or to assume responsibility for its management, should be referred for advance review to an appropriate standing committee of the Faculty and, at the discretion of such a committee, to the Faculty as a whole."

In the fall of 1968 President Goheen asked the University Research Board to consider how the University might best go about the very considerable task of reviewing its present affiliations with other organizations as well as proposals for new ones. In response to that request the Board suggested a procedure that meets our criticism of that followed in the past.[43]

The major elements of the procedure developed by the Board are as follows: The Office of the Provost is to maintain a list of all organizations of which Princeton is a member, and membership in each must be sponsored by a faculty member or a member of the Administration. The Administration will approve membership in an organization (or continuance of a membership), if the organization's sponsor vouches for its effectiveness, indicates that any funds required to maintain membership are available, and certifies that the organization does not undertake classified research, has no financial relationships with the University that would pose potentially serious conflicts of interest for the officers of the University, does not receive its income from sources that cannot be freely divulged, and is not engaged to any significant extent in influencing political decisions or in activities "inappropriate to the objectives of the University." When a sponsor cannot make such a statement, membership in an organization is not necessarily barred, but it must be referred to the Executive Committee of the Council of the Princeton University Community for consideration, and, if the organization in question is engaged in research, to the University Research Board as well. Particularly important cases may also be referred to the full Council.[44]

This procedure is well designed to focus the attention of the chief officers of the University on those memberships in organizations that are likely to be controversial and to give them the advice of a group representative of the whole University in acting on questions regarding them. Because leases of campus property can be controversial for many of the same reasons that memberships in organizations are, we would only recommend further that these also be referred to the Council's Executive Committee (and, at

[43] The Research Board's proposal was approved by the Faculty on September 15, 1969 and by the Undergraduate Assembly on November 5, 1969.

[44] Any question regarding an affiliation of the University with another organization may, of course, be raised in the Council even after that affiliation has been approved in accordance with the procedure described above.

that group's discretion, to the Council itself) before final decisions are made with regard to them. In the referral of leases of campus property for review the term "campus" ought, moreover, to be broadly construed.

Rules of Conduct

The establishment of the Council of the Princeton University Community this fall brought substantial changes to Princeton's procedures for making and applying rules of conduct. The Council is now responsible for representing the interests of the University as a whole in the making of rules of conduct, although rules will continue to be made also by administrative officers and by the Faculty, the Undergraduate Assembly, and by various other groups. In particular, the Council has authority to make rules of conduct for resident members of the University community, to oversee the making of such rules by the University's officers and by other bodies within the University community, and to oversee the application of all rules of conduct.[45] The Council's Committee on Rights and Rules is its chief agent in reviewing and appraising rules and procedures with regard to rules.[46]

The Council's exercise of its authority in this area of its affairs is limited in several ways. First, the Council itself will normally make only such rules as are applicable to all resident members of the University community, and, in accordance with its Charter, will normally delegate to other bodies the responsibility for the making of rules regarding matters of concern mainly to particular groups within the University community.[47] Thus, the Council may in the first instance properly make rules about damage to University property or about protests and demonstrations but not about conduct in dormitories nor about the extra-University employment of faculty members. It will properly act on these latter matters only if the groups normally responsible for regulating them have been seriously neglectful of the general interests of the

[45] See Appendix 7, p. 138 for the relevant provisions of the Council's Charter.

[46] *Ibid.*, p. 148. See also the discussion of the Committee on Rights and Rules in *A Proposal to Establish the Council of the Princeton University Community* (May, 1969), p. 9.

[47] See Appendix 7, p. 138.

University and have failed to respond to the Council's complaints, after having been given full opportunity to do so.[48]

Second, the Council has no right to make rules that infringe the freedoms of speech, inquiry, publication, or association, nor to limit the freedom of action of members of the University community in any other way, unless such limitation clearly serves substantial and legitimate interests of the University. The purposes for which the Council is to oversee the making and applying of rules of conduct imply these restrictions; these purposes are to insure that rules of conduct at Princeton "protect the rights of individuals and the legitimate interests of the University, and that they are clear in meaning, fair, enforceable, and in conformity with the law."[49] We agree with those who argued that the Charter should be more explicit in this regard, however, and therefore favored attaching a bill of rights to that document.[50]

Finally, the Council's ability to exercise its authority effectively will depend on its ability to maintain the confidence of the major constituencies of the University. By amending its Charter, the groups represented in the Council may withdraw or limit its authority; and its actions may be reviewed by the Board of Trustees. Even in the absence of these formal restraints, the Council's authority would be tenuous, should any substantial segment of the University community come to feel that the Council could not be relied upon to act fairly and reasonably with regard to rules of conduct.

The establishment of the Council brought a re-assignment of responsibility not only for the making of rules of conduct but also for hearing and deciding cases in which rules are alleged to have been violated. When the Council's Charter was approved, Princeton had three quasi-judicial bodies with such responsibilities: The Committee on Discipline, the Subcommittee on Student Life and Discipline of the Committee on the Graduate School, and the Committee on Conference. The first of these heard cases involving undergraduate students; the second, cases involving graduate students; and the third, cases involving faculty members and cases

[48] See Appendix 8, pp. 153-154 for the interpretation of the Council's Charter presented to the Faculty by this Committee and accepted by that body in its meeting of June 3, 1969.

[49] See Appendix 7, p. 138 and Appendix 8, pp. 153-154.

[50] As the Council recently did on March 10, 1970. See Appendix 7, p. 152.

on appeal from the other two committees. The Council's Judicial Committee was added to this judicial system.

As a result, an important class of cases has been removed from the jurisdictions of the other quasi-judicial bodies, since the Judicial Committee hears, in the first instance or on referral, "cases that involve alleged violations of those established rules and regulations whose violation constitutes a serious infringement of the recognized rights of members of the University community, a serious offense against the University's mission, a threat to the ability of the University to carry on its essential operations, or a substantial impairment of the common and legitimate interests of the University."[51] The Judicial Committee also has the authority to rule on cases that have been heard by the other quasi-judicial bodies, when unfairness in their proceedings has been alleged. One effect of this grant of authority was to relieve the Committee on Conference of responsibility for hearing cases on appeal.

We think that these changes in Princeton's judicial system should be accompanied by some further ones. First, the jurisdiction of the Committee on Conference should be altered. The Committee should be given more explicit authority than it now has over all cases involving violations by faculty members of rules applicable only or mainly to members of the faculty and over such other cases involving faculty members as are not within the jurisdiction of the Judicial Committee.[52] At present, there is no provision for the executive officers of the University to take such cases to the Committee before acting on them.

Second, there should be changes in the composition, procedures, and status of the Subcommittee on Student Life and Discipline of the Committee on the Graduate School. Decisions of the Subcommittee are at present only advisory to the Dean of the Graduate School; the Subcommittee has no graduate students among its members; and it offers few procedural protections to persons accused of violating rules. A University-wide body representing graduate students would be the group most appropriate to sug-

[51] See Appendix 7, pp. 150-151. A more extended discussion of the Judicial Committee and its responsibilities will be found in *A Proposal to Establish the Council of the Princeton University Community* (May, 1969), pp. 12-14. The procedures of the Judicial Committee and its rules regarding the conduct of hearings appear as Appendices 9 and 10.

[52] See Appendix 1, p. 109 for the change in the charge of the Committee on Conference that we suggest to implement this proposal.

gest new arrangements with regard to the Subcommittee. If such a body is not established within a reasonable length of time, however, the Dean of the Graduate School, in consultation with the Committee on Rights and Rules, should undertake that task.

In addition, we urge the Undergraduate Assembly and the Dean of Students to review present arrangements with regard to the Committee on Discipline. Given the Committee's changed jurisdiction in the future, both the composition of its membership and its status as a committee of the Faculty should be re-examined. So should the status of the Dean of Students as the Committee's Chairman. The Dean's role as Chairman *and* Dean makes him responsible both for bringing charges against students and for sitting in judgment of such charges. Mixing executive and judicial functions in this way may occasion no difficulty in some circumstances, but as a general rule the practice is open to serious question.

When the Council and its Judicial Committee began to function, the responsibilities of the executive officers of the University with regard to rules of conduct were altered in two respects: Their rule-making is now subject to review by the Council, and they will now have to decide initially whether to refer particular cases to the Judicial Committee or to one of the other quasi-judicial bodies. For the rest, they will continue, under the general direction of the President, to hear and investigate complaints about violations of rules, to handle many such complaints informally, and, when a case cannot be settled "out of court," to carry out the decisions of the University's quasi-judicial bodies. The President remains ultimately responsible for seeing that rules are observed and rights protected, and his powers of enforcement will continue to include the right to suspend a person's membership in the University, pending a hearing on the case.[53] This power is one appropriate to emergency situations, but in our judgment it should be invoked only for reasons relating to the health and well-being of persons involved or in situations that seriously threaten the physical safety of members of the University, impair or seriously threaten to impair the ability of the University to carry on its essential operations, or threaten serious damage to University property.

[53] See *Students and the University*, p. 21, and *Rules and Procedures of the Faculty* (1967), p. 21.

With its procedures for making and applying rules of conduct very substantially reformed, the University should next make some extensive changes in the body of rules now in force and in the kind of publicity it gives its rules. The new procedures we have described and proposed reflect a commitment to due process in the application of rules of conduct and to like treatment of like offenses; some existing rules, and some present practices with regard to them, are not consistent with these principles. We therefore urge the Committee on Rights and Rules of the Council to review Princeton's rules of conduct with these objectives in mind:

All discriminatory applications of rules to particular groups within the University community should be eliminated, unless the nature of the offense described by the rule provides a reasonable basis for such discrimination. It is reasonable, for example, to apply only to the residents of dormitories certain rules regarding conduct incidental to living in dormitories; it is not reasonable to make "disorder and bad manners arising from the use of liquor" a serious offense only for undergraduate students. We could cite additional rules of the latter sort; they should be revised to make their application general or they should be discarded. Revision of the rules along these lines was begun last spring, but only begun, when the University statement of policy on campus protests and demonstrations, formerly applicable only to students, was made to apply to all members of the faculty and staff as well.

Members of the University community should be able to find out easily and in reasonably precise terms the kinds of conduct enjoined by the University and the possible penalties that may attach to violations of particular rules. Realizing this objective would require drastically revising or discarding rules that easily lend themselves to arbitrary interpretations, for instance, the rule addressed to undergraduate students that "all students are expected to conduct themselves in a manner becoming scholars and gentlemen." It would mean attempting to state maximum penalties, at least, for violations of rules. And it would mean that some rules, at present made known only by word of mouth, if at all, would have to be written and published. Graduate students in particular are not now adequately informed of the University rules of conduct applicable to them, and, while there have been few cases of disciplinary action against graduate students in recent years, there have been some.

Finally, there should be a serious and sustained effort to attach

penalties to particular kinds of misconduct more appropriate than many of those now exacted. If undertaken, this effort will almost certainly fail to yield completely satisfactory results, for universities do not have a wide range of sanctions available to them, and a penalty that is appropriate for members of one group within the University community may be inappropriate for those of another. That does not mean, however, that an effort of this kind will not be worthwhile. It already has been. "Loss of room draw rights" and "expulsion from dormitory," two new penalties recently proposed for violations of dormitory rules by the U.G.A.'s Committee on Undergraduate Social Life, may be more fitting penalties for some kinds of misconduct in dormitories than the indefinite suspension frequently imposed in the past.

Conflicts of Interest

There is a *prima facie* case for universities to adopt the following rule in making decisions: No one should participate in any university decision from which he will derive substantial personal advantage or in whose outcome he has a substantial economic interest. Such a rule has two purposes: To protect the integrity of decisions and to protect their reputation for integrity.[54] One should not underrate the importance of the latter objective because it arises out of a concern for appearances. A university's ability to maintain itself as an institution dedicated to the advancement and dissemination of learning depends to a very great extent on the credibility of its claims to be such. If those who make decisions for it are known to have personal interests that are opposed to its interests as a university, that credibility may be seriously undermined, even if such conflicts are in fact resolved in the university's favor.

The rule just suggested is not an easy one to apply in practice, and it is not clear that it should be applied without exception. Notions like "participation," "decision," and "substantial" are

[54] Cf. The Association of the Bar of the City of New York, Special Committee on the Federal Conflict of Interest Laws, *Conflict of Interest and Federal Service*, pp. 3-4: "Regulation of conflicts of interest seeks to prevent situations of temptation from arising. An Internal Revenue agent auditing his own tax return would offer a simple illustration of such a conflict of interest. Perhaps the agent's personal interest in the matter would not affect his discharge of his official duty; but the experience of centuries indicates that the contrary is more likely, and that affairs should be so arranged as to prevent a man from being put in such an equivocal position." See also pp. 6-7.

vague. Does the informal giving of advice about a decision constitute participation in it? Is a recommendation a decision? If a man owns stock in a company from which the university is considering the purchase of equipment, how much stock must he own, and how large must the prospective purchase be, for his economic interest in the transaction properly to be regarded as substantial? To enforce or abide by the rule, one must answer such questions, and they should be answered with due regard for all university interests involved. While a university should be concerned with protecting the integrity of its decisions and their reputation for integrity, it also needs good advice and ready access to information. Strict interpretation or application of the rule could sometimes mean sacrificing unduly these latter interests.

Princeton now has a number of rules that exclude persons who have strong personal stakes in certain kinds of decisions from participation in them. The kinds of decisions are quite diverse: No one employed by the University is to negotiate or influence the negotiation of contracts between Princeton and any organization with whom he has a consulting or other significant relationship.[55] A faculty member may not at any time "tutor students privately in preparation for those examinations in which he himself takes part, either in the way of preparing questions or reading papers."[56] The University's procedures for making decisions on the appointment and advancement of faculty members have been drawn to preclude any faculty member's sitting in judgment of his own case or that of competitors. Princeton subscribes to the joint statement of The Council of the American Association of University Professors and the American Council on Education on preventing conflicts of interest in the administration of research sponsored by the federal government, and the Office of Research Administration offers advice to those involved in sponsored research on problems regarding conflicts of interest.[57]

It is not hard to suggest shortcomings in these arrangements.

[55] *Rules, Procedures and Prerequisites of the Professional Research Staff and Professional Technical Staff of Princeton University*, p. 21.

[56] *Rules and Procedures of the Faculty of Princeton University* (1967), p. 71.

[57] See American Council on Education, *On Preventing Conflicts of Interest in Government-Sponsored Research at Universities* (December, 1964), and the memorandum on conflict of interest from the Dean of the Faculty to members of the Faculty, Professional Research Staff, and Professional Technical Staff of April 27, 1965.

They prescribe conduct with regard to only a few of the kinds of decisions in which the extra-University interests of members of the University community may conflict with their obligations to the University. They have no application to participation in the making of decisions by either Trustees or students. They fix no one with continuing responsibility to do what surely needs to be done, namely, to identify and consider remedies for problems deriving from conflicts between personal and University interests as such problems arise in practice.

We are not prepared to say what the University should do finally with regard to these matters, but we do have suggestions about what it should do next.

First, we think that Princeton should develop rules and procedures for disqualifying members of the University community from participation in any University decision from which they will derive substantial personal advantage or in whose outcome they have a substantial economic interest. It should be the obligation of the member of the community to raise issues regarding the propriety of his participation in decisions; he should have access to confidential advice on the merits of such issues; and he should be finally responsible for deciding whether or not to disqualify himself. If a member of the University community does disqualify himself from participation in a decision, it should be a matter of record that he has done so. If he is requested not to disqualify himself by officers of the University or by the body charged with responsibility for a decision, that fact should also be a matter of record. Initially at least, these procedures should be worked out separately by and for Trustees, on the one hand, and members of the Administration, Faculty, Professional Research Staff, and Professional Technical Staff, on the other. Most problems are likely to arise in these groups, and those problems are likely to differ characteristically as between the Trustees and the other groups. For example, problems connected with participation in decisions about investments will be of importance for the Trustees, but not for most members of the other groups.

Second, the President, in consultation with groups just named, should establish advisory committees on problems relating to conflicts of interest, one for the Trustees, and one for the other groups. These committees would be responsible for developing and implementing rules and procedures of disqualification; for

offering advisory opinions on the desirability of disqualifications in particular cases; and for reviewing the adequacy of rules, procedures, and policies. The committees should be small, they should have ready access to legal advice, and their members should be chosen with a regard to the continuity of the membership of each committee.

If adopted, these proposals would not impose a rigid and untested code of conduct on members of the University community. They would bring sustained attention to problems arising from conflicts of interests and permit the University to work toward better solutions to those problems.

PART II

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNIVERSITY

ALTHOUGH we have already said a good deal about how the University is and ought to be organized, the organization of the University deserves further examination. It is a subject about which many members of the University community are not well informed: Princeton's constitution is largely unwritten, and such documents as the *By-Laws* of the Board of Trustees and *The Rules and Procedures of the Faculty* are inadequate and often misleading guides to the University's actual practices. Moreover, specific issues have been raised about some of the institutions of the University, and, even if this were not so, one could not take for granted their adequacy in the face of new problems and new tasks.

The Board of Trustees

The Trustees are legally responsible for seeing that the University pursues the purposes for which it was chartered and that its assets are used to further these purposes.[58] The Board is not free to shift this responsibility to anyone else. The legal authority of the Trustees to direct the affairs of the University is commensurate with their responsibility, that is, it is substantially complete. The authority of the Trustees is also collective. Between its meetings its Executive Committee may exercise the Board's full powers,[59] but otherwise, no committee of the Board and no individual Trustee has any authority to act for the University, except

[58] As specified in the *Charter of the Trustees of Princeton University* (1963), section 2, pp. 5-6, these are: "the conduct of a university not for profit, including colleges and schools affiliated therewith, in various branches within or without the State of New Jersey, both graduate and undergraduate; the promotion, advancement, evaluation and dissemination of learning by instruction, study and research in the humanities, religion, social sciences, engineering and applied sciences; the awarding of certificates, diplomas and degrees; and engagement and participation in projects of instruction, study and research for the benefit of national, state and local governments and for the general public welfare."

[59] Except that it may not remove or elect a Trustee or the President of the University.

as such authority may have been delegated to them by the Board as a whole.

At present Princeton's Board of Trustees has 37 members,[60] each of whom has the same rights and duties. As might be expected in a body this large, a good deal of the Board's work is done in committees, both standing and *ad hoc*. The Board and its committees on Finance and Curriculum normally meet four times each year; the Executive Committee, the Committee on Plans and Resources, and the Committee on Buildings and Grounds normally meet six times each year; and other committees meet as necessary.

In the demonstration of May 2, just before the establishment of the Special Committee on the Structure of the University, the Board of Trustees was sharply criticized. The demonstration's leaders made it clear that their primary concern was not with specific decisions the Board had made or failed to make:

> The issue is not whether the trustees are doing their job well. The issue is that there is no justification for such a group of men controlling the destiny of an institution and a community in which they have no legitimate place. The University is a community of students and faculty, not businessmen.[61]

Since May, 1968, surveys of faculty and student opinion, letters and memoranda to our Committee, and testimony at hearings of our Committee have shown that a considerable number of students and faculty members take skeptical or critical attitudes toward boards of trustees, as have students and faculty members at other universities. Such attitudes have been reflected in proposals that the Board's proceedings be open, either wholly or in part; that its membership include, be entirely made up of, or be elected by, students and members of the faculty; or that the Board be abolished outright.

To proceed very far or very fruitfully in considering criticisms of Princeton's Board of Trustees, or the merits of proposals with regard to it, one must confront some quite basic issues concerning the role of any such board in the governing of a university. In many

[60] When young alumni Trustees will have been elected in 1970 and 1971, the Board will have 39 members, only one short of the upper limit of 40 set by the Charter.

[61] From a handbill distributed by demonstrators on May 2, 1968.

respects Princeton's Board is like the boards of most non-Catholic, private universities; indeed, it is those features of Princeton's Board that are most typical that have drawn most criticism. What features of the typical board of trustees are subject to change? Which would it be desirable to change?

Practically speaking, a body with the legal powers and responsibilities of a board of trustees is a necessary feature of the government of a private university. It is, because for private universities at least, legal status as a corporation is a virtual necessity: It is hard to believe that Princeton, or any other private university of comparable size, could for long maintain its instructional and research programs, were it not authorized by law to act as a single individual and endowed by law with rights distinct from those of the persons associated with it at any particular time. Corporate status, however, implies the existence of *some* group of persons legally responsible for the actions of the corporation and with the authority to speak in its name—it implies, that is, a body like a board of trustees at least in that respect.

What has just been said does not necessarily mean that legal authority over the affairs of a university need be located in a board of the usual sort, that is, a board of non-resident members. The non-resident trustee carries out his duties in addition to those of his principal occupation and has no other formal status in the university. Such trustees are in a relatively poor position to evaluate the particular contexts in which many issues of policy arise in a university.

Nonetheless, we think there are good reasons for involving such men in university government. First, they are likely to approach certain kinds of decisions, particularly budget decisions, more disinterestedly than a university's faculty, staff or students, and such disinterestedness is of critical importance if the resources of a university are not to be diverted from its central purposes. For example, those who draw up a university's budget must decide each year the proportion of total expenditures to be allotted to increases in faculty salaries. Ideally, this decision will be made, not just to benefit the particular persons who happen to be members of the faculty, but with a view to its effects upon the university's ability to attract and retain highly qualified faculty members and with a due regard for the other needs of the university. Actually or potentially, faculty members bring to such a decision a conflict between their personal interests and those of the university. Non-resident trustees

normally do not. One can easily multiply examples of this sort. The interests of faculty, staff, and students are likely to bias them toward expenditures for present, as opposed to future, needs, and they have direct, personal interests in the outcome of decisions regarding tuition, scholarships and fellowships, rent subsidies, fringe benefits, and the many services provided by the university, as well as in those regarding salaries. While decisions on all of these matters are likely to be better made if the views of faculty, staff, and students are taken into account, no one should want the making of such decisions to become either an exercise in logrolling or a contest of power among interested parties. The involvement of non-residents in the governing of the university can help to insure that decisions do not become either of these things.

Second, non-resident trustees who are properly qualified can make an important contribution to the welfare of a university by explaining its needs and policies to others and defending it against efforts to infringe freedom of discussion and inquiry. Universities cannot in isolation sustain themselves as places of learning; they are, particularly now, financially fragile and vulnerable to political attack. Neither can universities take for granted the good will, understanding, or tolerance of others. Too many people over too long a time and in too many places have shown themselves ready to "set things right" in the academic world by sacrificing intellectual freedom. Non-resident trustees can be much-needed and effective allies of a university's faculty, staff, and students in resisting undue interference in the affairs of the university by other "outsiders." They can be helpful allies in other matters as well, for, in the manner of auditors, they can certify to alumni and to the public the need for changes in policy and the desirability of new ventures.

Third, by bringing a variety of views to bear on the issues of university policy, trustees can help to insure a better definition of the public interest in the affairs of a university, an interest that the boards of trustees of all charitable corporations are by law bound to represent. At the very least, a university in whose government laymen had no voice would be in danger of becoming overly "academic," in the pejorative sense of that term. Although the training of scholars is one of the important things a university does, few would argue that that is all it should do. Scholars are for the most part men deeply convinced that what they are doing, and the ques-

tions that interest them, are of the utmost importance. Left to themselves and unchecked in their decisions either by students or by laymen, members of university faculties are too apt to favor graduate education over undergraduate education, specialized courses over general ones, and the cultivation of their own fields of knowledge over the cultivation of those in which others are pioneering. Trustees who are not themselves academics are not qualified to construct courses of study, but they can raise questions about courses of study and they can be an important source of support for administrators in their efforts to innovate and to balance the claims of specialized education against those of general education.

Fourth, non-resident trustees can aid a university in raising funds. It is almost needless to say that this contribution can come at too high a price; in our opinion, no one should be elected to a board of trustees only because he gives large sums of money. It is also true, however, that colleges and universities must depend for much of their income on private donors or government or both; that the autonomy of a university is more secure if its sources of support are diversified; and that men are more likely to give, and to ask others to give, to a university in whose life they are personally involved.[62] These considerations are particularly important now. Princeton, like other universities, is entering a period when budget decisions are in all likelihood going to be a great deal harder to make and more unpleasant to accept than they have been in the recent past. Costs, and the pressure to spend, can be expected to rise sharply, while it is very much to be doubted that either private giving or income from other sources will increase comparably.

Finally, trustees can bring to a university various kinds of expert knowledge. Princeton, without a school of law or medicine, has received valuable professional advice from the lawyers and doctors on its Board of Trustees. Its Trustees in banking and finance have played a major role in the management of the University's investment portfolio.

We think that what has just been said makes a strong case for

[62] In Princeton's $53 million capital funds campaign, its Trustees were convinced that if they, who were directly connected to the University, did not show their support for the campaign, no one else could easily be persuaded to do so. Every Trustee contributed to the campaign and together the Trustees gave over $7.5 million. [*See Final Report of the Princeton Capital Campaign* (1967), pp. 14-15.]

involving non-resident trustees in the governing of a university, but not a case that can stand without qualification. Such trustees *can* further the purposes of a university in the ways we have suggested; they may not in fact do so. They may have little interest in the problems of higher education or the problems of the university of which they are trustees. They may be hostile to academic freedom or have a very narrow conception of what it implies.[63] They may be poor fund raisers. They may be insufficiently diverse with regard to age, occupation, race, sex, place of residence, experience, and outlook on social questions either to represent well the interests of the larger society or to be able to win a sympathetic hearing from the public at large for their explanations of the actions and needs of universities.

Furthermore, neither a board of trustees made up of members drawn from outside the university, nor a board of trustees composed in any other way, is likely to govern a university well if it in fact exercises all the powers that a board is legally entitled to exercise. A board of the usual kind will not be able to formulate or judge the merits of policies on some matters nearly so well as those who are giving full-time attention to them. In some matters that require the technical knowledge of experts, the board may not include such men. In any event, we think it clear that responsibility for making decisions in a university should vary with the nature of the matter to be decided, since the contributions that the various groups in a university can make to any particular kind of decision, and their interests in them, vary greatly from decision to decision. If this is so, then any board of trustees should delegate a great deal of responsibility to others; because any board, whether

[63] In a recent survey of members of the governing boards of colleges and universities in the United States, 69 per cent of those responding thought that all campus speakers should be officially screened, 40 per cent thought that university administrations should control the contents of student newspapers, and 27 per cent disagreed with the statement that, "Faculty members should have the right to express their opinions about any issue they wish in various channels of college communication, including the classroom, student newspaper, etc., without fear of reprisal." See Rodney T. Hartnett, *College and University Trustees: Their Backgrounds, Roles, and Educational Attitudes* (*Educational Testing Service*: Princeton, 1969), p. 21.

Princeton's record in protecting academic freedom has been an excellent one. For an account of it, see Harold Stein, "Safeguards for Academic Freedom at Princeton," *American Political Science Review* (December, 1960), pp. 981-983.

composed as most now are, or as the new Council of the Princeton University Community is, or in any other way that we can imagine, will not be appropriately composed for deciding many kinds of issues. As former President Dodds has observed, a system of higher education in which plenary powers are conferred on boards of trustees has worked, "only because those in authority refrain from exercising their full powers."[64]

This has been a long prelude to stating some conclusions that we reached on general issues before we had begun to examine Princeton's Board of Trustees in detail: The legal authority held by boards of trustees is incident to a private university's status as a corporation. Such boards should delegate a good deal of their authority to others. They should include members drawn from outside the university. The members of such boards should bring a variety of backgrounds, viewpoints, and interests to it, and they should be chosen with a view to insuring that the contributions that a board of trustees can make to a university are made in fact. Trustees should be chosen, and should conduct the board's affairs, in a manner that builds and maintains confidence among all those groups whose cooperation is necessary to achieving the purposes of a university.

How does Princeton's Board exercise its powers? While a lawyer, speaking in a court of law, might describe what Princeton's Trustees do as management of the University's affairs, a student of administration would not find that an accurate description of the Board's actual role. The Trustees may raise questions about any aspect of University policy or operations, but the directness and extent of their participation in the setting of policy varies markedly in different areas of policy-making.

On a wide range of issues the Board has delegated to the President, and through him to others, the authority to take what is effectively final action. As we have already observed, the Trustees have not acted on individual cases in the appointment and advancement of faculty members, and, while the Board is consulted in advance of any final decisions on proposals to establish new departments and on any other curricular proposals that involve large expenditures, it is the Faculty that creates or abolishes courses, sets the requirements for degrees and awards them, and

[64] Harold W. Dodds, *The Academic President* (McGraw-Hill: New York, 1962), p. 212.

prescribes the rules and procedures of the various courses of study. The Board has also delegated responsibility with regard to the appointment of many administrative officers; most matters with which the University Research Board deals; the formulation of rules of conduct and dormitory regulations; the setting of specific criteria for the admission of students; the operations of the Library; health and athletics; and the operations of the University's physical plant. From this list it should be evident that the Board has delegated authority in instances in which the making of good decisions depends heavily on specialized knowledge, day-to-day exposure to problems, intimate knowledge of the facts of particular cases, or all three.

In determining how some of the Board's powers will be exercised, the views of Trustees are one of several influences that count. One of the Board's most important responsibilities is the selection of the President of the University (a matter about which we will have more to say later); Princeton's presidents have actually been chosen, however, after consultation between a committee of the Trustees and a committee of the Faculty in which the two groups sought mutually acceptable candidates. The Trustees annually review the University's budget and make a final judgment as to whether it is consistent with the University's financial health; others, however, have a very great deal to say about what expenditures are to be for. Plans for development and proposals for major changes in policy are brought to the Board for approval, but in its consideration of them, the Trustees may give great weight to the views of others. In announcing the approval of coeducation, for example, the Trustees observed that ". . . on this issue a large majority of the Faculty and virtually all members of the senior administration are in accord. While the Trustees have final responsibility, and must fully accept it in reaching a decision, the considered judgment of Faculty and administration should weigh very heavily." They also offered as a "compelling consideration" in their decision, "the general shift in disposition toward a favorable view of coeducation among the younger members of both our alumni and our faculty" and "the clear preferences of the large majority of current day students."[65] It is fair to say that in most matters Princeton's

[65] Trustees' Statement on Coeducation, January 12, 1969, *Princeton Alumni Weekly*, January 21, 1969, p. 13. See also Luther Munford, "Anatomy of a Decision," *Princeton Alumni Weekly*, November 11, 1969, pp. 8-12, 18-19.

Board of Trustees concerns itself primarily with certain *aspects* of the policies suggested to it, principally the financial implications of such policies, their consequences for Princeton's relations with its alumni and with other agencies and institutions, and the consistency of proposals for action with the achievement of the purposes of the University as those purposes are defined in its Charter.

In a few areas of policy-making, the participation of the Trustees is direct and their views, though not the sole influence on policy, are undoubtedly the major one: The Board's Committee on Finance directs the investment of the funds of the University and supervises the management of its off-campus real estate. Its Committee on Buildings and Grounds, with the advice of the President and others, actively supervises long-range physical planning, landscaping, and architectural styling. The Trustees also set fund-raising policies, help to identify potential sources of important financial support, and raise funds.

Our surveys and hearings produced evidence of dissatisfaction with the procedures regarding physical planning, particularly among members of the faculty. Subsequently, both students and additional faculty members were appointed to the President's Advisory Committee on Architecture. This Advisory Committee now takes part in regular, periodic meetings with the Trustees' Committee on Grounds and Buildings, as well as with the President and the Director of Planning, Plant and Properties.

In our opinion the outlines of Princeton's unwritten constitution, insofar as they relate to the exercise of the powers of the Board of Trustees, are good ones. In that constitution authority in the University, which in legal terms is centralized, is in fact decentralized. In this light, the Trustees' Statement of Policy on Delegation of October 24, 1969, is an important one, for it confirms their satisfaction with, and their intention to continue, existing arrangements for the sharing of responsibilities.[66] We think that it would be desirable for them to indicate as well that if these arrangements should require change, changes will be made only after full consultation with the representative bodies of the University community (always excepting cases of emergency).

The members of Princeton's Board of Trustees, like those of most universities, are predominantly laymen, and not professional

[66] See Appendix 11, pp. 161-163 for the Statement.

educators.[67] Last year the occupations best represented on the Board were business, law, and banking: Together they accounted for over half its members. At that time also, 40 per cent of the Trustees were 60 years of age or more and none were younger than 40; all were men; all were white; all were alumni of Princeton; and almost all were Protestant.

Last year both the Trustees themselves and the committee of the Alumni Council responsible for nominating alumni trustees took steps to increase the diversity of the Board's membership. Both groups sought to bring younger men to the Board and did; the average age of the eight Trustees elected in June, 1969, was 37 years; the average of the six who left the Board was 64. Other important changes in the composition of the Board were the addition to it, for the first time, of black members and of members who are full-time students.

We think that the Board's membership should be diversified still further and that new members should be selected with a view to making the Board as a whole a better bridge between those within and without the University community.

How are these goals to be achieved? We reject a quota system for representing groups on the Board of Trustees. While it is desirable for Trustees to bring a range of views on higher education to the Board, it would not be desirable for them to think of themselves mainly as spokesmen for particular groups, something which a quota system would be apt to encourage them to do. Furthermore, a quota system is a rigid way of diversifying a board's membership—the talents a university needs in its trustees will vary from time to time—and it is a system based on the false assumption that diversity in backgrounds or occupations necessarily means a fruitful diversity of views. A better way of proceeding is simply to identify important points of view that a board may lack at any given time, and then to fill vacancies with trustees who have such qualifications and who otherwise promise to be useful and devoted members.

We also reject the notion that Princeton students or faculty members should serve on the Board of Trustees, although we do think it important for the Board to have members whose viewpoints on education are akin to those of students and faculty mem-

[67] As Table III indicates, only 14 per cent are engaged in education, although 22 per cent have been so engaged.

TABLE III

CHARACTERISTICS OF TRUSTEES: PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES, SELECTIVE PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY 1968-1969, AND PRINCETON UNIVERSITY 1969-1970

Characteristic	*Private Universities (per cent)*	*Selective Private Universities (per cent)*	*Princeton 1968-69 (per cent)*	*Princeton 1969-70 (per cent)*
OCCUPATION				
Banking and Finance	17	14	14	14
Business and Industry	33	30	28	27
Law	10	11	14	16
Medicine	2	2	8	5
Education and Research	9	11	11	14
Public Affairs	6	13	6	8
Student	—	—	0	5
Publishing	1	1	3	5
Ministry	5	3	6	5
Other	16	14	6	2
AGE				
39 or under	1	1	0	11
40-49	14	11	17	17
50-59	37	42	42	41
60-69	36	38	36	27
70 or over	10	8	6	5
RACE				
White	97	99	100	95
Black	1	0	0	5
Other	0	0	0	0
SEX				
Male	91	85	100	100
Female	8	14	0	0

Figures for private universities and selective private universities are from Rodney T. Hartnett, *College and University Trustees: Their Backgrounds Roles, and Educational Attitudes* (Educational Testing Service: Princeton, 1969), pp. 57, 59. The occupational categories in Mr. Hartnett's study have been consolidated in some cases. Percentages may not add to one hundred because of rounding.

In reading this table one should bear in mind that, since it reports only current occupations, it de-emphasizes the actual diversity of experience in the memberships of boards of trustees. In the case of Princeton's Board, for example, a member who is currently a businessman was formerly both a public official and a member of the faculty of the Department of Economics.

bers at Princeton. Faculty members and students now express their views authoritatively in actions of the Faculty, the Undergraduate Assembly, and the Council of the Princeton University Community, and it is hard to believe that their views would be better represented by faculty or student Trustees. If not, the role of student and faculty Trustees would be a highly ambiguous one, and their presence on the Board might decrease, rather than increase, the influence of students and faculty members on University policy. Consider the case of a faculty Trustee who, on an important issue before the Faculty, had voted with the minority. When the issue came to the Board of Trustees, he might:

(1) abstain both from speaking and voting, making his presence on the Board of no value;
(2) regard himself as a delegate of the Faculty, speaking (probably unconvincingly, since it would be against his better judgment) and voting in favor of the position taken by the majority of the Faculty;
(3) regard himself as a delegate of the Faculty, voting in favor of the position taken by its majority and explaining that his own views differed—for an uncertain effect at best;
(4) regard himself as representing no one but himself, arguing and voting against the position taken by the majority of the Faculty.

A student Trustee who disagreed with a stand taken by a majority of the Undergraduate Assembly would be in precisely the same position.

Inquiries of faculty Trustees and former faculty Trustees at Cornell, Haverford, and Sarah Lawrence have confirmed us in our opinion about student and faculty trusteeships. Almost all the faculty Trustees of these institutions thought faculty trusteeships helped to improve communication between their trustees and their faculties, but they also noted "complications" in the relations of faculty trustees to their faculties and the danger of undue influence by faculty trustees on a board's view of faculty opinion. Since the benefits for communication of faculty and student trusteeships can be gotten in other ways, these complications are best avoided.

In our judgment, the actions taken by the Board last year have provided the means necessary to diversify its membership and to strengthen its ties to resident members of the University com-

munity. The setting of the term of Charter Trustee at 10 years[68] now makes possible, prudently, the election of Charter Trustees at much younger ages than in the past; when Charter Trustees served from the date of their election until the age of 70, the Board was rightly reluctant to elect young men as Charter Trustees. The establishment of the young alumni trusteeships insures that by 1971 at least 10 percent of the Board's membership will be in their early twenties and will have viewpoints akin to those of Princeton's students; in most cases, young alumni Trustees will themselves be students, although not at Princeton. The abolition of the requirement that alumni Trustees be graduates of at least 10 years' standing has removed an important formal restriction on the representation of younger alumni on the Board. The nomination of new Charter and Term Trustees by the Executive Committee of the Board after consultation with the Committee on Governance of the Council of the Princeton University Community should bring the views of resident members of the University community to bear on the selection of new Board members in an effective way. As we conceive this arrangement (and as it has been developing), the Committee on Governance and the Trustees' nominating committee will strive to insure that nominees, and the policies to be followed in making nominations, are acceptable to both groups.[69]

There remains to be said something about problems of communication between the Trustees and other members of the University community. These problems, and their consequences, can be serious ones. It is easy for resident members of the University

[68] With persons holding such trusteeships to be eligible for re-election no sooner than one year after the expiration of their term. See Table IV for summary information regarding the terms and modes of selecting the various classes of Trustees and the numbers of trusteeships in each class.

[69] As an alternative to this procedure, we considered the direct election of a certain number of Board members by faculty members and students, with faculty members and students not themselves eligible for election. We think the consultation procedure a better one, because an election by any very numerous group has some serious shortcomings as a way of selecting a trustee, whose office does not have the attractiveness of a governorship or senatorship. If the strengths and weaknesses of nominees are not openly and publicly discussed, voters are apt to have little to go on in casting their ballots; if the merits and demerits of candidates are the subject of public debate, potential nominees may be reluctant to become such. The second problem has been largely avoided in the election of alumni trustees, but not the first. Neither problem should be severe in the election of young alumni trustees, but that is because the candidates will be known personally to large numbers of those who will have to choose among them.

TABLE IV

TERMS, NUMBERS, AND MODES OF SELECTING TRUSTEES, BY CLASS OF MEMBERSHIP

Class of Membership	*Term*	*Nominated by:*	*Elected by:*	*No.*
Trustees *ex officio*[1]	During period of official term			2
Charter Trustees	10 years[2]	Executive Committee, Board of Trustees, after consultation with Governance Committee of the University Council[3]	Board of Trustees	20
Term Trustees	4 years	Executive Committee, Board of Trustees, after consultation with Governance Committee of the University Council[3]	Board of Trustees	4
Alumni Trustees (at large)	4 years	Nominating Committee, Alumni Council	Alumni at large	4
Alumni Trustees (Regional)	4 years	Nominating Committee, Alumni Council	Alumni, by regional groups	4
Young Alumni Trustees[4]	4 years	Senior class	Junior and Senior classes, two classes most recently graduated	4
Alumni Trustee (Graduate School)	4 years	Nominating Committee, Association of Graduate School Alumni	Alumni at large	1

[1] The President of the University and the Governor of New Jersey. The President is also chairman *ex officio* of the Board of Trustees.

[2] For Charter Trustees elected in June, 1969, or thereafter. Charter Trustees elected before that date serve until the age of 70.

[3] Procedure applicable since the establishment of the Council of the Princeton University Community in November, 1969.

[4] Two young alumni Trustees are now serving on the Board, a third will be elected in 1970, and a fourth in 1971.

community to cast the Trustees, whom they rarely encounter, in the role of absentee landlords, and alumni, too, may easily come to think of the Board as inaccessible. On their side, Trustees cannot find it easy to acquaint themselves with the views of other members of the University community nor to address themselves to groups diverse in their idiom and habits of mind. The President and other officers of the Administration, members of the Faculty's Committee on Conference, and alumni groups[70] help to keep the Board informed of the views current in the University's constituent groups, and recent innovations in the Board's procedures—publication in advance of its agenda, for example, and post-meeting press conferences—should contribute to a better understanding of the work of the Trustees and the bases of their decisions.[71] Nonetheless, we think more can and should be done to keep the Board informed of what others think and others informed of what the Board does and why.

We have three suggestions. First, we think that joint meetings of committees of the Board and committees of the Council of the Princeton University Community for the exchange of views on general or controversial issues would often be helpful in enabling the Board and resident members of the University community to work toward mutually acceptable solutions to problems. Second, we think the Board and its committees should make some of their sessions public, in whole or in part. The dispelling of mystery about the work of the Board would, in our opinion, be a considerable gain. Closed sessions for the discussion of the appointment of officers of the University or for the purpose of permitting members to state freely and to abandon positions on issues seem

[70] And, recently, the Committee on Governance of the Council of the Princeton University Community.

[71] On June 9, 1969, the Board declared itself as follows:

"The Board of Trustees recognizes the importance of open and ready means of communication between itself and the Faculty, student body, staff, and alumni of the University. To this end it seeks to achieve, in cooperation with the President, active and effective interchange of information and views, through such means as published agenda of Board meetings, press conferences, consultation between committees of the Board and the Faculty and student committees, invitations to representatives of the Faculty and students and of the Alumni Council to attend meetings of the Board where appropriate, and attendance of Trustees, when possible, at open meetings of the University community." (Minutes of the Board of Trustees, June 9, 1969.)

to us quite justified, but these caveats do not apply, certainly, to all meetings. Finally, we think the Board should regularly make public statements of the reasons for actions on major issues, something they have done on occasion in the past. The Trustees' statement on coeducation was a model in this regard, explaining clearly and fully the grounds for an important decision.

The Presidency

Princeton's system of government makes its presidency by far the most important position from which leadership in its affairs may be exercised. The *By-Laws* of the University charge the President with "general supervision of the interests of the University,"[72] and by virtue of his office he is chairman of the Board of Trustees; chief executive officer of the Corporation and head of its administrative staff; presiding officer of the Council of the Princeton University Community; and presiding officer of the Faculty. He is also a member of all standing committees of the Board of Trustees; the Board's Committee to Nominate Committees; the Faculty's Committee on Committees; the Executive Committee of the Council of the Princeton University Community; and the Council's Committee on Governance. He meets regularly with the Priorities Committee of the Council; the Faculty Advisory Committee on Policy; the Faculty Advisory Committee on Appointments and Advancements; the Administrative Council; and the Staff Council. He is frequently in attendance at meetings of alumni organizations and of other groups of the University community. These arrangements make members of all the University's constituencies accessible to the President in the context of discussions of, and decisions about, the major issues of University policy.

The foremost responsibility of the President is to provide leadership in the affairs of the University, although he also has time-consuming ceremonial duties and is responsible for seeing that policies already agreed upon are implemented. To state the matter in very general terms, he must raise questions of policy, propose answers to such questions, and get action on them. At present, the most important of these questions concern the academic programs of the University, the relations among its various constituent groups, its financial problems, and its relations with government.

[72] *By-Laws of the Trustees of Princeton University* (1967), p. 5.

The President's responsibility for leadership also requires him to take the lead in recruiting a highly qualified faculty and administration, in persuading individuals and institutions that Princeton University merits their support, and in explaining and defending the actions of the University before the public. As the general deputy of the President, the Provost shares in these responsibilities.

While we have been unable to give more than passing consideration to the organization of the office of President, we have considered the procedure for electing a president and his term of office. Despite the obvious importance of the subject, the *Charter* and *By-Laws* of the University have little to say about how the President is to be chosen. The former declares that "the Board shall, from time to time, elect and appoint a chief executive and academic officer of the corporation, who shall be known as the President of the University."[73] The latter says that the election of the President shall be by ballot, and that, while the Board may provide for a nominating committee, any Trustee may present a nomination.[74]

An account of the procedure followed in the election of President Goheen will serve to illustrate what actual practice has been. In 1954, two years before President Harold W. Dodds reached the age of retirement, the Board of Trustees instructed its Executive Committee to begin consideration of candidates to succeed him. The Board's Executive Committee then appointed a seven-man sub-committee for that purpose, and made arrangements for it to be advised by a committee of the Faculty. This Faculty committee, which also had seven members, was elected by the Faculty without special provision for the representation of Divisions or of non-tenured faculty members. Those elected were all professors of full rank, four from the Natural Sciences, two from the Social Sciences, and one from the Humanities. The committee's chairman, Professor Henry DeW. Smyth, was elected by its other members.

The Trustees' subcommittee and the Faculty committee held a joint meeting soon after they had been established. At this meeting the Trustees, in the words of one of them, indicated that the Board "would not want to consider a candidate who was known to be unacceptable to the Faculty." The two groups discussed the qualifications to be sought in a President and agreed that he should be an educator, that he should be able to serve at least fifteen

[73] *Charter of the Trustees of Princeton University* (1963), p. 10.
[74] *By-Laws of the Trustees of Princeton University* (1967), p. 4.

years (that is, that he should not be older than 53), and that it would be desirable, though not essential, for him to hold either a graduate or undergraduate degree from Princeton or to be a member of the Princeton Faculty.

After this meeting, both groups began to assemble lists of candidates. At a later joint meeting, they eliminated many names from further consideration and consolidated those remaining into two short lists, one of men at Princeton and the other of outsiders. Each of the committees then gave careful consideration to the qualifications of the men named on these lists and reached full agreement on a recommendation to the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees. The recommendation was accepted and forwarded, and the Board elected the nominee. The confidentiality of discussions in the committees was strictly preserved, and the comments of those involved make it evident that the Trustees and the Faculty committee had no difficulty in establishing an effective working relationship.

It is hard to see how any President who began his term of office without the confidence of both the Trustees and the Faculty could hope to succeed. For that reason, we think the procedure just described is a good one and propose but three modifications in it: (1) The faculty members who participate in any future search for a President should include at least one representative from each Division of the University and at least one member of the nontenured faculty; (2) representatives of the student body should participate in the consideration of candidates; and (3) students and faculty members consulted by the Board of Trustees should be elected by a procedure which will insure, insofar as that is possible, that they represent something of the diversity of opinion that may exist within the student body and the Faculty. Any committee or committees established in accordance with these proposals should be kept small, both for the sake of effectiveness and to protect the confidentiality of the proceedings.

Princeton's President serves no fixed term. He must retire at the age of 68; otherwise "he continues in office during the pleasure of the Board."[75] Yale's presidents serve on much the same basis, and, recently, President Kingman Brewster has proposed setting a term of years after which Yale's Trustees "would make a systematic reappraisal and explicit consideration of the president's reap-

[75] *By-Laws of the Trustees of Princeton University* (1967), p. 4.

pointment."[76] The objective of such a procedure would be to hold presidents accountable for their conduct in office and to do so in an effective way:

> While I do not think that [the President's] power can be fully shared by any legislative process, I do think that his own tenure should be at risk if he is to enjoy the latitude of executive decision which the job requires.
>
> In thinking through the question of the president's responsibility in the case of a disruptive confrontation, I concluded that the power to act on the spot should not be stultified; but that in spite of all the risks of Monday morning quarterbacks on the faculty, the president should submit his actions to review and should, if necessary, make the issue one of confidence. If he were to receive a vote of no confidence, he should offer to resign.[77]

President Brewster believes the present power of trustees to dismiss presidents does not insure presidential accountability, "since it cannot be exercised without running contrary to the expectation of lifetime tenure."[78]

We endorse the principle that presidents should be accountable for their conduct in office but are not persuaded that a set term of office is a good way to achieve that result. The best time for a university to change presidents is when the incumbent no longer wants to lead or has lost his ability to do so. We see no reason to believe that either of these things is likely to occur at any fixed time, and, if that is true, a fixed term of office could easily delay action at times when it is required. The *other* means that President Brewster suggests as a way to hold presidents accountable, putting the issue of confidence, seems to us to be one more likely to serve the interests of universities, even if that issue were formally put (as seems probable) only very rarely. It is true that the absence of a fixed term of office for the President imposes on the Trustees responsibility for a continuing assessment of the quality of the President's leadership, both as that is evidenced in what he is attempting

[76] Address to student members of the Yale Political Union, September 24, 1969. President Brewster suggested that such a consideration of reappointment "might be seven years after the initial appointment, perhaps at somewhat shorter intervals thereafter."

[77] *loc.cit.*

[78] *loc.cit.*

to do and in his ability to win support for what he is attempting to do. The more frequent consultations between the Trustees and other groups of the University community that we have already recommended should help them, however, in discharging this responsibility effectively.

Before turning to other matters, we want to call attention to a problem of which our service on this Committee has made us keenly aware: The President's great and increasing workload. While the establishment of the Office of the Provost three years ago helped, further measures may have to be taken if the President's job is to retain manageable proportions. President Goheen has suggested one possible measure: The creation of a new office of Chancellor, with the man appointed to that position assuming the President's present responsibilities with regard to fund-raising, relations with groups outside the University, and the work of the Board of Trustees. We have not been able to give this proposal, or others addressed to the same problem, the kind of study they deserve, but want to record our belief that the problem requires prompt and serious attention.

The Organization of the Faculty

For many years meetings of the University Faculty have been held once each month during the academic year.[79] Although meetings in addition to those regularly scheduled are not frequent, they are easily convened: The President (or in his absence, the Provost) may at his discretion call a special meeting of the Faculty; he must convene a special meeting if requested to do so by any committee of the Faculty or by any six faculty members. Professors, associate professors, assistant professors, and lecturers with rank of professor or associate professor are entitled to vote at meetings. When on full-time appointment, others holding the rank of lecturer, instructors, assistants in instruction, holders of visiting appointments, and members of the Professional Research Staff are entitled to attend meetings and to speak to issues,

[79] More precisely: "The University Faculty meets regularly on the Monday next following the formal Opening Exercises in September and thereafter on the first Monday of every month during the academic year, except when this falls in recess, in which case the Faculty meets on the first Monday after recess; provided however that, unless the Faculty at its September meeting votes otherwise, no regular meeting is held in October." *Rules and Procedures of the Faculty of Princeton University* (1967), pp. 21-22.

but not to vote. Attendance varies considerably. When only routine matters appear on the agenda, no more than forty to fifty persons may attend. When action is to be taken on a proposal that is widely regarded as both important and controversial, attendance may rise to 350 or more.[80]

The amount and kind of business transacted at Faculty meetings also varies greatly from time to time. From February 4, 1963, to February 3, 1964, the Faculty met twelve times; meetings averaged a little more than half an hour in length; and most matters considered that year may properly be described as routine. Five years later, from February 5, 1968, to February 3, 1969, the Faculty met seventeen times; meetings frequently ran two hours or more; and action was taken on a wide range of issues that were not routine and on which, in some instances, opinion was initially quite divided. Among these issues were the University's relationship to the Institute for Defense Analyses; the readmission of graduate students whose programs of study were interrupted by the draft; grants for overseas research; the appointment of the Special Committee on Afro-American studies; the adoption of *Students and the University*; coeducation; parietal rules for undergraduate students; the evaluation of courses by undergraduate students; the University's investments in companies doing business in southern Africa; a statement of policy on protests and demonstrations; and the establishment of the Special Committee on the Structure of the University. Matters taken up by the Faculty's standing committees are perhaps the best indication of the Faculty's usual concerns. Apart from its own organization, these include the graduate and undergraduate curricula; the admission of students; regulations regarding the advancement of students; sponsored research; the appointment and advancement of faculty members; the operation and development of the Library; the academic calendar; undergraduate social life; public lectures; and financial aid to students. Reports from, and the questioning of, the academic officers of the University are also regular and important features of Faculty meetings.

Arrangements for the conduct of meetings are not elaborate.

[80] This figure probably represents about 75 per cent of those faculty members entitled to vote who are not on leave, since attendance is quite low among those who are entitled to attend meetings but do not have voting rights. Attendance is difficult to estimate, however, since most votes are voice votes and, even when votes are tallied, abstentions are not.

The President prepares the agenda in consultation with the Clerk, and an item will be placed on it at the request of any two faculty members. The agenda is posted in departments and the texts of motions and reports are circulated to all faculty members in advance of each meeting. The President (or in his absence, the Provost) presides at meetings, and the Clerk serves as recording secretary. A standing rule requires that any important proposal be placed in the hands of the Clerk not later than noon on the second Friday preceding the meeting at which it is to be brought up for action. The *Rules and Procedures of the Faculty* also require that "actions taken at a meeting of the Faculty are to be held as confidential until released by competent authority" and assert that "a member of the Faculty participating in a meeting has the right to assume that his utterances and votes will not be revealed to anyone outside the membership of the Faculty." For some time now, the President and the Clerk have given an account of Faculty actions in a press conference immediately following meetings, frequently with the sponsors of major motions in attendance. In such reports, however, care has been taken not to attribute points of view to particular persons and not to report how particular persons voted.

In our judgment, meetings of the whole Faculty have been and continue to be a valuable institution. They encourage participation by faculty members in the setting of University policies. They are an important forum in which the University's administrative officers can explain, and can be asked to justify, what they have done and propose to do. In emergency situations, general meetings have proved themselves a place in which differences of opinion may be exposed, argued out, resolved, and action taken which faculty members themselves accept as expressing the view of the Faculty. In such situations, Princeton's Faculty has not had to search for a way to speak and has therefore been able to devote its whole attention to what it should say.[81]

[81] Dissatisfaction with the conduct of Faculty meetings among members of the Faculty appears to be no greater than is probably endemic in a group of people not fond of organization. In a survey of faculty members last fall, 43 per cent of those responding rated procedures for handling business in meetings as "good," 40 per cent rated them "fair," nine per cent rated them as "poor," and nine per cent expressed no opinion. Younger faculty members and faculty members who have been at Princeton only for a short time did not express disapproval of present procedures any more frequently than older faculty members or faculty members with many years of service at Princeton.

We have two changes to suggest in the arrangements for meetings of the Faculty: That voting rights be extended to all faculty members on full-time appointment and that the rule regarding the confidentiality of meetings be modified.

The effect of the first suggestion would be to give the right to vote in Faculty meetings to 80 to 100 instructors and lecturers not assimilated to the two senior professorial ranks. These lecturers and the instructors are members of the Faculty engaged full-time in teaching and research. They are now eligible to vote for members of the Council of the Princeton University Community and to serve on the Council itself, committees of the Council, and committees of the Faculty. Some of the lecturers affected are on three year appointments, like assistant professors, and some are appointed for indefinite terms. Instructors are on one year appointments, but have an average period of service in that rank of from two to three years. We think there is a *prima facie* case that faculty members on full-time duty should have voting rights in meetings of the Faculty and that the burden of proof should fall on any who take the contrary point of view.[82]

We have found it hard to agree on the extent to which meetings of the Faculty should be public, though not on what may reasonably be said for and against their being so. When a group has responsibilities that make its actions of importance to many outside its membership, as the Faculty has, it can act in secrecy only at the risk of suggesting that its proceedings will not bear public scrutiny. The opening of Faculty meetings to the campus press and to observation by other members of the University community would refute any such suggestion. Open meetings should also encourage a better understanding in the University community generally of the issues that the Faculty considers, its actions, and the reasons for its actions. More than they do now, Faculty meetings could serve an educational function. A danger of admitting the press and non-faculty observers to meetings of the Faculty is that discussion may be inhibited thereby. It is one thing to talk to one's colleagues, another to speak for possible quotation in the press. A practical consideration of some importance is that the Faculty room will not accommodate many observers in meetings well attended by faculty members. The room helps to engender

[82] See Appendix 1, p. 100 for the motion we propose to implement this suggestion.

an atmosphere that has real, if not readily measurable, consequences for discussion, and many faculty members would be reluctant to change their normal meeting place.

Different people will assign different relative weights to these potential advantages and disadvantages, and they are the more likely to do so because actual experience with public meetings of the Faculty cannot be a guide. Because we believe the case for open meetings of the Faculty is a strong one, however, and because we think their possible disadvantages can be minimized, we recommend that the Faculty modify its procedures as follows: Reports and proposals distributed to the Faculty normally should be made public at the time of their distribution. Faculty meetings should normally be open for attendance as observers to representatives of the campus press, to members of the Council of the Princeton University Community, and to such additional members of the University community as can be seated.[83] Non-faculty members of University or Faculty committees who have been invited to appear in connection with a committee report, and other guests who have been invited by the President or the Faculty, should also normally be free to remain during the whole session to which they have been invited. These rights of attendance should be subject to some restrictions: Those in attendance should not attribute remarks made in discussion to particular members without their permission. It should be possible by special motion to declare a portion of a meeting off the record and all in attendance should be bound to preserve the confidentiality of the matter covered by such a motion. By a vote of two-thirds of the Advisory Committee on Policy, or of one-third of the members of the Faculty present and voting at a meeting, it should also be possible to declare a session closed to observers, in whole or in part.[84]

These proposals would open Faculty meetings to attendance by an additional number of persons small enough for the Faculty room to accommodate them under normal circumstances. The largest group to be admitted as observers at all meetings, Council members, are independently elected representatives of the major constituencies of the University community. Representatives of

[83] These latter should be selected by a random procedure from among those who have indicated an interest in attending a particular meeting.

[84] See Appendix 1, pp. 102-103 for the changes in the *Rules and Procedures of the Faculty* that we suggest to implement these proposals.

the campus press would be free to report the substance of discussions, the sponsors of motions, the results of votes, and, with the permission of the faculty members involved, who said what. Members could speak without feeling that they were speaking for a public record, and the right to hold executive sessions, a right that we think any group should have in some circumstances, would be preserved.

Without its system of committees, the Faculty as a whole would find it virtually impossible to consider issues in an orderly way, even though committee recommendations are defeated, amended, or sent back often enough to refute any notion that action in Faculty meetings is *pro forma.* Faculty members do not appear to be greatly dissatisfied with the organization of Faculty committees,[85] and, after a review of the present committee system, we concluded that some changes with regard to it would be desirable, but saw no need for its radical revision.

We do think that steps should be taken to increase participation by members of the non-tenured faculty in the work of Faculty committees, both to bring new points of view to that work and to distribute it more equitably. We have already suggested reserving positions on the Committee on the Course of Study and the Committee on Conference for non-tenured faculty members.[86] We recommend that positions be reserved for them also on the committees on Admission, Committees, Athletic Eligibility, Examinations and Standing, Public Lectures, the Library, the Princeton University Conference, Schedule, Undergraduate Life, and Scholarships.[87] Non-tenured faculty members now hold somewhat less than ten per cent of the positions on Faculty committees; these changes would increase that proportion to at least 20 per cent. In making this recommendation, we are assuming that the academic departments will, as they should, take committee service into account when they forward recommendations with regard to salaries, reappointments, and advancement in rank.

In our opinion certain changes in the procedures of committees,

[85] In our survey of the opinion of faculty members last Fall, 38 per cent of those responding thought the committee organization of the Faculty "good," 29 per cent thought it "fair," 7 per cent thought it "poor," and 27 per cent had no opinion.

[86] See above, pp. 14-15, 37.

[87] See Appendix 1, pp. 107-114 for the changes in the *Rules and Procedures of the Faculty* that we propose to implement this recommendation.

and the procedures with regard to them, are also in order. In consideration of a complaint of most members of Faculty committees, we would make it the explicit duty of committee chairmen to acquaint new members with the responsibilities and practices of their committees. We would require all Faculty committees to report their activities to the Faculty at least once annually, as most now do. Such reports would not need to be lengthy and could be either written or oral; they would serve to insure a continuing review by the Faculty of the work of its committees. We would make provision in the *Rules and Procedures of the Faculty* for the dismissal of committees and the recall of committee members; undoubtedly, the Faculty has a right to do either of these things now, but such a provision would make that right explicit. We would alter the procedures for electing members of the Advisory Committee on Appointments and Advancements, the Committee on Conference, the Committee on the Course of Study, and the University Research Board. When one position only is to be filled on any of these committees, we recommend that election be by the system of the alternative vote. This system of election insures that the preferences of a majority of those voting bear on the election of members. When two or more positions are to be filled simultaneously, and the qualifications for the positions are the same, we recommend that election be by the system of the single transferable vote, a system which insures that groups of voters of diverse opinion will succeed in electing representatives in rough proportion to their numbers.[88]

We recommend the abolition of the Committee on Honorary Degrees and the Committee on Public Speaking and Debate. The first of these committees no longer has a reason for being, since, with the establishment of the Council of the Princeton University Community, its responsibilities were reassigned to the Council's Committee on Governance. The responsibilities of the Committee on Public Speaking and Debate, in our judgment, can easily and usefully be assigned to others. A faculty adviser, reporting to the Chairman of the Department of English, can adequately supervise the activities of the Princeton Debate Panel. The Committee

[88] See Appendix 1, pp. 105-107, 109, 113 for the changes in the *Rules and Procedures of the Faculty* that we suggest to implement these proposals. For an explanation of the two systems of election, see Appendix 12 and Appendix 13.

on Examinations and Standing can select the valedictorian and the Latin salutatorian.[89]

We propose that the Faculty's representatives on the Executive Committee of the Council of the Princeton University Community be made *ex officio* the members of the Faculty Advisory Committee on Policy. The issues that are of concern to the Council's Executive Committee are for the most part those that have concerned the Advisory Committee on Policy in the last several years. We see no need, therefore, for there to be two different sets of faculty members in the two groups, although it may be desirable from time to time to constitute *ad hoc* committees to consider issues of policy that are of particular interest to the Faculty.[90] Since one of the responsibilities of this reconstituted Advisory Committee on Policy will be to participate in the nomination of faculty members to committees of the Council of the Princeton University Community, its members should make arrangements to consult the Faculty's Committee on Committees, so that nominations of candidates for positions on both Faculty and Council committees can be made with the needs of both sets of committees in mind.

Some further proposals with regard to particular committees can best be presented simply by listing them.

(1) *The Committee on Undergraduate Life.* Some of the matters that have occupied members of this committee in the past are now the concern of others, or should be. The general supervision of undergraduate organizations should be entrusted to the Dean of Students, working with the Undergraduate Assembly. Rules of conduct for undergraduate students are now considered by the Dormitory Council, the Undergraduate Assembly, the Council of the Princeton University Community, and the Council's Committee on Rights and Rules. The Committee's charge should be revised to reflect these changes.[91]

(2) *The Committee on Public Lectures.* Representatives of the Deans of the College and of the Graduate School should be added to the membership of this committee, so that it can easily be made aware of the intellectual interests

[89] See Appendix 1, p. 110.
[90] See Appendix 1, p. 108.
[91] See Appendix 1, pp. 112-113.

of students and faculty members, as these are evidenced by proposals for new courses and for student-initiated seminars.[92]

(3) *The Graduate School Committee.* Despite its size, this committee is an adequate link between the academic departments and the Dean of the Graduate School. We suggest, however, that the Committee's Policy Subcommittee be elected from among the Committee's members, not appointed by the Dean, as it now is.[93]

(4) *The University Committee on Scholarships.* We would increase the number of faculty members on this committee to four, to insure the representation of each of the Divisions of the University.[94] Alternatively, we would transfer its responsibilities to a reconstituted Committee on Admissions and Scholarships.

(5) *The Committee on the Library.* We propose the addition of two members of the Professional Research Staff to this committee.[95]

We have not examined in any detail the organization of academic departments, programs or school, but we have discussed at some length the selection of departmental chairmen. At present, the President appoints chairmen of departments normally after consultation with the tenured members of the departmental faculties concerned. We propose that such consultation be extended to all members of departmental faculties on full-time appointment.

The Undergraduate Assembly

On March 20, 1967, a student referendum established the Undergraduate Assembly of Princeton University. The Assembly replaced the Undergraduate Council, which, since 1927, had been recognized by the Trustees as the official representative body of undergraduate students.

It seems clear in retrospect that the Undergraduate Council did not represent students as they wanted to be represented, at least in its last years. The Council had been consulted frequently by the Administration and had worked for, and secured some changes in, rules affecting students. It supervised, and sometimes spon-

[92] See Appendix 1, p. 112.
[93] See Appendix 1, pp. 110-112.
[94] See Appendix 1, p. 114.
[95] See Appendix 1, pp. 111-112.

sored, extra-curricular activities. It rarely if ever considered general issues of University policy, however, or issues with regard to the undergraduate course of study. Its opponents branded it a do-nothing organization. They also considered it cliquish: The UGC membership was restricted to the three officers of each class, three students chosen by them to be the Council's officers, and an executive secretary elevated each year from the Council's staff. With 52 per cent of the undergraduate student body voting in the March referendum, the advocates of "a stronger and more representative voice for students in University decision-making"[96] won by a margin of better than five to one. Less than a month later the Undergraduate Council formally voted its own abolition, the first officers of the Undergraduate Assembly were elected in May, and in October, 1967, the Assembly held its first meeting.

The Constitution of the Undergraduate Assembly declares that "the legitimacy of student government derives from students"[97] and that the Assembly shall consider "any question relating to or affecting undergraduate life at Princeton, or any other question of interest to the undergraduates."[98] The Assembly's purposes, as stated by its Constitution, are identical to those of the body it replaced. The UGA is to represent Princeton's undergraduate students "to the faculty, administration, and Trustees of the University" and to "persons or groups outside the University whenever such representation is called for."[99] It is also to provide services for members of the University community and to exercise leadership in extra-curricular activities.[100]

If the Assembly is like the UGC in its formally stated purposes, it is not in composition. The Assembly today consists of four officers elected by the entire undergraduate student body, twelve class officers elected by their respective classes, and 34 representatives elected from geographically defined districts. District representatives are to represent no fewer than 80 and no more than 120 students. By making the Assembly a relatively large body, and by providing for various modes of representation in it, the Assembly's

[96] Forum for a Democratic Student Government, *The Two Constitutions Compared* (a circular distributed at the time of the referendum).

[97] Preamble, *Constitution of the Undergraduate Assembly of Princeton University*.

[98] Article IV, section A.

[99] Article I, sections B.1, B.2.

[100] Article I, sections B.3, B.4.

founders hoped to make it broadly representative of all undergraduate students.

The UGA meets regularly twice each month from the end of October to the beginning of May, except during vacations and examination periods. These meetings are open and public, although the Constitution permits special meetings to be declared closed. The Assembly's agenda is established by its President and must be published at least two days in advance of all regular meetings. The Vice-President of the Assembly serves as its presiding officer.

Over the past three years the UGA has interested itself in a wide variety of issues. At first these were mostly in regard to matters of particular concern to undergraduate students: the absence of washing machines in dormitories, the allocation of tickets to athletic events, the car rule, and the rule regarding visitors in dormitories. Later, the Assembly debated and took positions on general issues of University policy—on the same issues that occupied the Faculty, Administration, and Trustees in the same period. Some of the Assembly's current concerns are expressed in its committee structure: There are committees on the course of study, undergraduate life, campus security, the external relations of the University, and community relations.

The Undergraduate Assembly's role in the government of the University has been changing, and still is. It is fair to say, however, that the Assembly and its members have shaped events at Princeton in the last three years in important ways, that the Assembly's influence has increased over that period, and that its present place in the constitution of the University is very different from that which the Undergraduate Council used to have. The Faculty has delegated to the Assembly the authority to define procedures for making and applying rules in the undergraduate dormitories, and it has become customary for the Faculty to consider issues when requested to do so by the Assembly. With the adoption of *Students and the University*, and with the establishment of the Council of the Princeton University community, the Assembly has become the appointing power for undergraduate members of Faculty committees, the Council, and the Council's Executive Committee.[101] The President of the University, other officers of the University, and the heads of Faculty committees have appeared before the Assembly

[101] More precisely, the President of the Undergraduate Assembly appoints the student members of Faculty committees, subject to the approval of the Assembly as a whole, and the Assembly elects Council members and members of the Council's Executive Committee.

to report, explain, or request action, and representatives of the Assembly have appeared before the Faculty for the same purposes. Last year and this, the President of the University has regularly consulted the UGA's Policy Committee on most of the same issues that he has taken up with the Faculty Advisory Committee on Policy, and he, or others, have requested consideration by the UGA of a large number of important matters: among these have been *Students and the University*, the report of the Patterson committee on the education of women, the three reports on the University's investments in companies doing business in southern Africa, the interim report of the Special Committee on the Structure of the University and our proposal to establish the Council of the Princeton University Community, the report of the Special Committee to Examine Princeton's Relationship to the Institute for Defense Analyses, the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on ROTC, a statement of policy on protests and demonstrations, and the statement of policies and procedures concerning Princeton's membership in other organizations developed by the University Research Board. As we have already noted, there were extensive efforts to bring the Faculty and the UGA into agreement on some of these matters, and one, the Research Board's proposal, was approved by the Faculty on the understanding that action on it would not be final until it had also received the approval of the Undergraduate Assembly. The Assembly has not limited itself to considering proposals referred to it: Its officers, or others of its members, have actively participated in framing many of the reports and proposals listed above, and several important measures, later adopted, originated in the Assembly.

The attitudes of undergraduate students toward the Undergraduate Assembly are difficult to gauge. Most consider themselves only fairly well informed about the organization and its activities.[102] Most also rate the performance of the Assembly as "fair."[103] Campaigns for the Assembly's offices appear to arouse considerable

[102] In the sample survey of undergraduate opinion sponsored by this Committee, 20 per cent of those responding considered themselves well informed about the UGA, 51 per cent considered themselves fairly well informed, and 30 per cent thought themselves poorly informed.

[103] In the survey just cited, seven per cent of those responding rated the UGA's performance as "good," 50 per cent rated it "fair," 27 per cent rated it "poor," and 21 per cent had no opinion. Freshmen and juniors had somewhat less favorable opinions of the Assembly than sophomores and seniors, although there was not a great deal of variation among classes in this regard.

interest and the turnout for these elections has been substantial: Sixty-six per cent in 1967, 65 per cent in 1968, and 60 per cent last year. The turnout for elections of district representatives is at about the same level, when these are contested. While some students who seek to influence University policies have by-passed the UGA entirely to press their case directly with the Administration, a considerable number have chosen to work through the UGA, or to work both through it and outside of it.

The chief problem of student assemblies (although not one peculiar to them) is this: If they are to have influence, they should have the support of the student body, or a large part of it; but, if they are to win the support of the student body, what they do must make a difference in the governing of the university. In our opinion the Undergraduate Assembly has been able to solve this problem better than most student representative bodies, but it has by no means solved it completely. Our most important recommendations with regard to it, therefore, are designed to increase both its responsiveness to the opinions of undergraduate students and its effectiveness.

In addition to the measures we have already recommended to that effect,[104] we propose three, which, taken together, would extend the UGA's responsibilities and enhance its ability to meet them. These measures are:

(1) That the Dean of Students seek the advice of the Undergraduate Assembly regarding the allocation of grants-in-aid given organizations of undergraduate students;
(2) That the Dean of Students and the Dean of the College (or their representatives) regularly be in attendance at meetings of the Undergraduate Assembly to report, and answer questions about, the current and prospective activities of their Offices; and
(3) That the Offices of the Dean of Students and the Dean of the College stand ready to provide a reasonable amount of clerical assistance to the Undergraduate Assembly and its Committees on the Course of Study and Undergraduate Life.

These proposals need no lengthy discussion. Clearly, the views of undergraduate students generally should be taken into account

[104] See pp. 21-22, 35, 45 above.

in distributing funds among their various extra-curricular activities, and the Undergraduate Assembly, as the body most representative of undergraduate students, is the best single source of advice about the views in this regard of the undergraduate student body as a whole. The activities of the Offices of the Dean of Students and the Dean of the College are of proper and continuing interest to undergraduate students; reports by the two Deans on these activities should help to keep members of the UGA informed of matters that concern them and those whom they represent, and the two Deans informed of sentiment in the Assembly. Clerical assistance is necessary to the effective functioning of any parliamentary body, and, given the Assembly's role in the affairs of the University, the University should provide such assistance in reasonable amount.

Any representative body may fail at times to reflect the views of those whom it is supposed to represent, but a student representative body is peculiarly prone to failure of this kind. Representatives in political bodies normally want to be re-elected, and, for that reason, seek to do what their constituents want them to do. Student representatives are frequently not eligible for reelection, or do not seek it, and thus may feel no compulsion to vote in accordance with the views of their constituents. Members of the Undergraduate Assembly are subject to recall;[105] while that is a partial answer to the problem just noted, the Assembly should, in our view, take steps to meet it in other ways as well.

First, we think that it should be possible for the undergraduate student body as a whole to express its agreement or disagreement with actions of the Assembly when there is good reason to believe that such actions are controversial. Specifically, we would permit two hundred students, by petition, or two-fifths of the members of the Assembly, to secure a referendum on any resolution passed by the Assembly or its Executive Committee. The wisdom of these precise conditions is of course debatable. We have tried to make them strict enough to discourage frivolous appeals from the decisions of the Assembly, but not so strict that they make referenda impracticable.[106]

Second, we think that elections of district representatives to the Assembly should be held twice a year, with elections set for the

[105] *Constitution of the Undergraduate Assembly of Princeton University*, Article VIII.

[106] See Appendix 2, p. 121 for the changes in the *Constitution of the Undergraduate Assembly* that we propose to implement this suggestion.

first Tuesday in October and the second Tuesday of the Spring term. District representatives are at present elected at the beginning of the school year. If issues develop in the course of the first term (and that is when they are most likely to develop), students have no opportunity to take them into account in voting for members of the Assembly. They should have that opportunity.[107]

Third, we recommend the election of district representatives by the system of the alternative vote.[108] Their election by this system would eliminate the need for the preliminary elections now held and would insure (except in the case of ties) that a majority of the votes cast would figure in deciding the outcome of contests. At present contests with more than two candidates in final elections for district representatives are more frequent than not,[109] and thus the possibility often exists that such elections will be decided by a minority of the votes cast.[110]

Fourth, we think that the present procedures for the election of the four officers of the Assembly, and of class officers, should be altered. These procedures permit as many as three candidates for each of these offices in final elections. Given the current system of voting, three-way contests make it possible for a candidate to win who is preferred by a minority of those voting, and they do not encourage the defining of issues. We propose, therefore, that voting in preliminary elections for these offices be according to the system of the single transferable vote,[111] and that the final elections be held to decide between the two leading candidates for each office as determined by that system. We would also set these elections (except that for officers of the Freshman class) for February. This is a good time to elect new officers for the Assembly as well as new members, since seniors find it difficult in the spring term to meet both the demands of participation in the affairs of the Assembly and of the requirement of a senior thesis.[112]

Some continuity of membership has clear advantages for any parliamentary body, and the measures just suggested have not been proposed in disregard of these. District representatives, who make

[107] See Appendix 2, p. 120.

[108] See Appendix 12 for an explanation of this system of voting.

[109] In the final election of October, 1967, there were three-way contests in 23 of 32 districts; in the final elections of October, 1968, three candidates or more contested seats in 19 of 33 districts.

[110] See Appendix 2, p. 120.

[111] See Appendix 13 for an explanation of this system of voting.

[112] See Appendix 2, pp. 118-120.

up two-thirds of the Assembly's membership, would stand for election twice a year; the Assembly's officers and class officers, who make up the remaining one-third, would be elected once a year. This arrangement seems to us to strike a reasonable balance between the advantages of continuity in the Assembly's membership and its disadvantages, provided the members of the Assembly as a whole are given greater control over the conduct of the affairs of the Assembly than they now have. To that end, we would locate the authority to appoint committee members in the Assembly, which now may approve or reject appointments, but is not unequivocally authorized to act on its own.[113] We would also locate responsibility for nominating committee members and for appointing staff members in a reconstituted Executive Committee. We would make that Committee a body of nine members, including the four officers of the Assembly and five additional members elected twice yearly from the Assembly by the system of the single transferable vote.[114] These changes would make the Executive Committee a small enough body to be easily convened and one more representative of the Assembly's membership than it now is. The new arrangements would also provide, as existing ones do not, for the continuing accountability of the Assembly's leaders to the Assembly, and through it, to the undergraduate student body as a whole.[115]

There are some additional revisions in the Assembly's Constitution that seem desirable to us, but these are for the most part in regard to matters of detail and need not be discussed here.

The Organization of the Graduate Student Body

We have already made two proposals with regard to the organization of the graduate student body: That the academic departments establish departmental committees of graduate students and that a University-wide organization of graduate students be established. In our judgment these measures would not only permit graduate students to contribute more effectively to the development of the graduate curriculum, as we argued earlier, but would have other benefits as well.

Student departmental committees can facilitate the participation

[113] See Appendix 2, p. 117.

[114] See Appendix 13 for an explanation of this system of voting.

[115] See Appendix 2, pp. 116-118 for the changes in the *Constitution of the Undergraduate Assembly* that we suggest to implement these proposals.

of graduate students in decisions about their programs of study and about the appointment and advancement of faculty members, but they can do more than that, and have done more than that, in departments where they exist. They may interest themselves in the arrangements for placing graduate students in jobs or the recruiting of new students or the opportunities for assistantships. Such committees can bring grievances to the attention of departmental chairmen or graduate representatives; acquaint new students with the customs and procedures of departments; and arrange colloquia and informal seminars. The nine-member steering committee elected by the graduate students of the Department of Chemistry appoints graduate students to serve on nine different departmental committees, including that on the undergraduate course of study; in the opinion of the chemists this arrangement brings new ideas to the Department's committees and contributes to the professional education of the students involved. At any particular time, student committees may not do a great deal and may not need to. One of their values, however, and one easily overlooked, is their *availability* to do things, should the need arise.

The case for a University-wide organization of graduate students can be put quite simply: The officers of the University and University-wide bodies make decisions about matters that are of importance to graduate students—decisions with regard to the graduate curriculum, fellowships, stipends and terms of employment for assistants in instruction, the conduct of members of the University community, the library, health services, housing, and social and recreational facilities. In the immediate future some of these decisions are going to be hard ones, involving choices about what must be given up. There is no practicable way regularly to consult all graduate students in making such decisions, nor is listening only to those who are most vocal, or who are best known to those making decisions, a satisfactory alternative to such consultation. The best that can be done is to discuss such matters with a group of graduate students who, to the greatest extent feasible, reflect the diversity of interests and attitudes in the graduate student body as a whole. The House Committee of the Graduate College and the committees at the Butler Tract and the Lawrence Apartments, although they can be usefully consulted on some issues, are not such groups, even collectively, since the considerable number of graduate

students living off-campus have no opportunity to influence their make-up.[116]

A body that could serve as a forum for the expression of opinion on matters of interest to graduate students, and that could be usefully consulted by other bodies in the University and by its officers, would not need to be elaborately organized. It should in our judgment include one member from each of the academic departments and two members from each of the residentially based committees of graduate students. Members might be either appointed by departmental and residential committees or elected by the graduate students of each department and residential area. Someone should be designated to preside at meetings and someone should be made responsible for informing members of meetings. It would be desirable for the group to have facilities for reporting its activities from time to time to the graduate student body as a whole.

This kind of organization, while simple, would permit orderly and continuing discussion of problems that merit such discussion. It would draw its membership from those groups into which graduate students organize themselves, formally or informally. Insofar as we can ascertain, it is the kind of organization that most graduate students think appropriate to their interests and needs.[117] Accordingly, we think that the Faculty should instruct the Dean of the Graduate school:

(a) to invite the graduate students of each department and of each of the three residentially based committees of graduate students to indicate their views on the desirability of estab-

[116] A note on the character and activities of these residentially based graduate student groups may be of interest. The House Committee of the Graduate College consists of four members elected by the residents of the Graduate College and three members appointed by its Master. Because elections to the Committee are held in March, first-year students are normally unrepresented on it. In the past the House Committee, aside from performing certain ceremonial functions, concerned itself mainly with arranging dances, forums, and athletic events. More recently, it has been consulted about rules of occupancy, rents, parking regulations, and arrangements for the security of the College. The committees at the Lawrence Apartments and the Butler Tract are small groups whose members are chosen rather informally. They have served as grievance committees and, in addition, have been consulted about rents and rules of occupancy.

[117] Eighty-six per cent of the graduate students who returned the questionnaire that we distributed to a sample of graduate students last Fall favored "some form of representative body for graduate students," and over half of these favored a "loose structure" for such an organization.

lishing a body of the sort we have described and their willingness to appoint members to it; and,

(b) in the event that two-thirds or more of these groups respond positively, to stand ready to help in the formation of such a body, to consult with it, and otherwise to facilitate its operation.

If a University-wide organization of graduate students is established, questions will almost certainly arise about what its powers should be. That issue cannot be sensibly settled now. We have already recommended that such an organization, if properly constituted, be given certain rights of intervention in decisions regarding graduate course of study,[118] and it might be desirable to assign it other responsibilities as well. Any quasi-legislative functions assumed by such a body, however, should be assumed only with the consent of the graduate student body as a whole. Moreover, if authority is to be delegated to a University-wide organization of graduate students by the Faculty, the Council of the Princeton University Community, or the officers of the University, they have an obligation to assure themselves that it is properly constituted. At a minimum, that means that such a body should be broadly representative of graduate students, that its members should be chosen by fair and orderly procedures, and that its own procedures should be fair and orderly.

A University Ombudsman[119]

When grievances arise out of a mistaken policy decision, a university's proper response is a better policy. Some grievances, however—those that arise out of misunderstandings, or inefficiency, or arbitrary administrative decisions—have little to do with an institution's policies and are not reached by policy changes, or by improved procedures for setting policy.

There are undoubtedly fewer people at Princeton who have serious grievances arising out of its administrative operations than there are at many universities. Because Princeton is small and residential, has a high ratio of faculty members to students, and has a history of informality in the relationship among administrators,

[118] See pp. 26-27 above.

[119] This section of the report represents the views of the majority of our Committee only.

faculty members, and students, it is comparatively easy for someone dissatisfied with a decision to discuss it with the man who made it, and, if still dissatisfied, to find people ready to take an interest in the case. Depending on their status and the nature of their complaint, members of the University community may get help, not only from friends, but from departmental advisers and departmental chairmen; student departmental committees; the Masters of Colleges and Halls; resident fellows in dormitories; the Orange Key Society; members of the Undergraduate Assembly and of the Council of the Princeton University Community; the Board of Advisers; the Personnel Office; and the offices of the Dean of Students, the Dean of the Chapel, the Dean of the College, the Dean of the Graduate School, and the Dean of the Faculty.

Nonetheless, there are deficiencies in the University's present procedures for hearing, investigating, and acting on complaints, and these are likely to become more serious as the University community becomes more diverse in composition. One may not know how to get action on a complaint—our surveys suggest that many members of the University community may find themselves in this situation—and sometimes it is not easy to find out. Even if one knows where one could go for help, one may not seek help for a variety of reasons: Fear of resentment or reprisal; a desire not to impose; a belief that one administrator, or faculty member, will be unwilling to question the conduct of another; a desire to keep the problem confidential; fear that the problem will be handled clumsily.

Perhaps these are things one can do nothing about, but we think it worth trying to do something about them. We therefore propose that Princeton establish the Office of University Ombudsman, for a period of three years, and on the understanding that the need for the Office will be reviewed two and one-half years after the appointment of the first Ombudsman.[120]

What would an Ombudsman do? First, his office would serve as a source of information for any member of the University community about where to take complaints and where to find help with problems. Experience at other universities suggests that providing such information is one of the most valuable services performed by an Ombudsman's office, and one that occupies a good

[120] This proposal, presented in the form in which we seek its adoption, appears as Appendix 3, pp. 123-124.

part of the time of its staff. Many, perhaps most, requests for information could be handled by the Ombudsman's secretary, or by student assistants, and would not need to require the personal attention of the Ombudsman himself.

Second, the Ombudsman would deal with complaints about decisions made by the officers and staff of the University. His duty would be unambiguous: To secure, if he could, proper and speedy action on all just complaints. To that end, he would be authorized to hear and investigate complaints of all kinds, to propose remedial action to any officer of the University or to any of its decision-making bodies, and, if he should judge it desirable, to publicize the results of his investigations. He would have no authority to reverse decisions: His ability to right wrongs would depend wholly on his ability to persuade, his access to the chief officers of the University, and his ability to bring public opinion to bear on problems. Experience shows that these are substantial powers.

Third, he would propose changes in administrative procedures, if his experience should suggest such changes to be desirable. To facilitate his ability to get proposals considered, we would make him a member *ex officio* of the Committee on Governance of the Council of the Princeton University Community and of the Council's Committee on Rights and Rules. The knowledge he would acquire about administrative practices, particularly about those which give cause for complaint, should make him a valuable member of both these committees.

Clearly, the position of Ombudsman would not be an easy one to fill. The Ombudsman should be widely respected both within the University community as a whole and within the constituent groups of that community. He should be tactful and a good listener. He should be knowledgeable about the University, independent of judgment, well endowed with common sense, and willing to act as his convictions dictate.

While the success of the Office of Ombudsman would depend mostly on finding an Ombudsman with these qualifications, the provisions made for his appointment and tenure in office should be appropriate to that objective. Thus, in our judgment, he should be well compensated for his services. The Executive Committee of the Council of the Princeton University Community should appoint him, and the consent of a two-thirds majority of the Council's members should be required to confirm his appointment. His term

of office should be fixed at three years, and, normally, he should not succeed himself. He should be subject to removal from office only in the case of disability, or for neglect of duty, or for malfeasance, and only by action of a two-thirds majority of the Council.

A Committee on the Future of the University

The most important questions of policy that face a university are those that relate to its basic purpose. If it is to promote learning, how should it do so? Learning about what? Learning for what? At no time is it easy to justify a particular set of answers to these questions, and answers that seem satisfactory today will not seem so tomorrow.

Universities are apt to give basic issues of policy much less attention than they deserve. Within the university community, some will not want to see such issues raised, because a redefinition of purpose is likely to be subversive of many vested interests. Others will not devote much thought to the university's purposes, because their primary concern will be with their own, or with those of their department or research center. Present emergencies and heavy routine duties make it difficult for those who have responsibility for leadership in the university to give sustained attention to its future problems and opportunities. The basic policies of a university may therefore be set inadvertently, in decisions on many seemingly small issues.

At Princeton planning for the future is a specific responsibility of the Committee on Plans and Resources of the Board of Trustees, of the Committee on Priorities of the Council of the Princeton University Community, and of the Office of the Provost. The Committee on Plans and Resources has "oversight of all programs designed to enlist financial support or to cultivate the interests of the University's constituencies in its welfare."[121] The Committee on Priorities, of which the Provost is Chairman, is to "consider issues that have arisen in the course of the preparation of the budget" and to "review plans for the development of the University in advance of any final decisions with respect to such plans."[122] The Office of the Provost has recently begun work on a five-year

[121] *By-Laws of the Trustees of Princeton University* (1967), p. 23.
[122] See Appendix 7, p. 149.

plan for the University, based on projections of the University's probable income and expenditures during that period of time; these projections and the plan will be reviewed by the Priorities Committee. In the recent past, and most probably in the near future, *ad hoc* committees, like that on the education of women, will undertake studies on specific subjects to facilitate planning with regard to them.

We think that there is a place at Princeton for another body that would concern itself with planning, however, one that we propose to call the Committee on the Future of the University. The charge of this Committee would be very broad: To consider how, in the long-run, Princeton University can most effectively further its central purpose, the advancement of learning. The members of the Committee would include the President of the University, the Provost, the Dean of the College, the Dean of the Graduate School, two members of the faculty, two undergraduate students, two graduate students, and one member from one of the other groups represented in the Council of the Princeton University Community. Those of its members not serving *ex officio* would be appointed by the Executive Committee of the Council, with the Council's consent, and would be chosen to represent the four Divisions of the University.[123]

The work of the Committee on the Future of the University should not duplicate that of other groups concerned with planning, and would not need to. The Committee on Priorities, and the Committee on Plans and Resources, have been mainly concerned with medium-range planning, while the Committee on the Future should concern itself with defining long range alternatives. The Committee on the Future should not devote any major portion of its time to budget issues or to fund-raising problems. It should expose its members to thought that challenges present-day conceptions of education, consider the implications of social and technological change for the mission of the University, and promote the study of ways that the University *might* make a greater contribution to learning.

The influence of the Committee on the Future should depend entirely on the persuasiveness of its reports and the value of its discussions to the chief academic officers of the University; the frequency and form of its meetings should depend on the nature of

[123] The proposal to establish the Committee on the Future of the University, in the form in which we seek its adoption, appears as Appendix 5, p. 126.

the projects its undertakes. While one should not try to prescribe all of the Committee's activities for it in advance of its establishment, one can suggest some of the things it might do: It might meet with those who seem to have worthwhile criticisms of higher education today, sponsor studies on special subjects, and arrange lectures and conferences. In any event it should keep a record of its discussions and report on these at least once annually.

Presented with a finding that the presidents of two universities had spent less than one-fifth of their time on educational matters, President Harold W. Dodds recommended a "bootstrap operation, the objective of which is not 10 or 20 but 50 percent of presidential time for education."[124] Our proposal for a Committee on the Future of the University is offered in the same spirit: It is a proposal to insure a place in the organization of the University for a group that will think about the many Princetons that are possible.

[124] Harold W. Dodds, *op.cit.*, p. 60.

PART III

COMMUNICATION

THE proposals of the preceding pages are intended to contribute to the development of a University government in which many participate and in which participants have maximum opportunity to arrive at mutually acceptable decisions. Such a government requires a wide distribution of knowledge about how to influence decisions, about current issues, and about what is to be said on the various sides of current issues. Both inside and outside universities, it is too often forgotten that these requirements are not easily satisfied.

At Princeton many faculty members and students lack basic information about how policies are set and, consequently, about how they may affect the setting of policies. They also feel that lack. They consider themselves poorly informed even about matters one would assume to be of significant interest to them. More than half the undergraduate students responding to our questionnaire last fall thought themselves poorly informed about the University's procedures for deciding what courses to offer (59 percent), for fixing degree requirements (56 percent), for evaluating teaching (56 percent), and for determining the content of courses (51 percent). Of the graduate students who returned questionnaires, more than half judged themselves poorly informed about procedures for setting rules (53 percent), for evaluating teaching (70 percent), for deciding what services to offer students and faculty members (73 percent), and for deciding what fellowship a graduate student should receive (52 percent). Faculty members considered themselves the best informed of the three groups we surveyed, and undoubtedly they are, but 40 percent of those responding thought themselves poorly informed about procedures for deciding on salary changes for faculty members, and 71 per cent thought themselves poorly informed about the selection of administrative officers.

These results should not be surprising. Many members of university communities are newcomers. Most students and faculty members, like most people, take little interest in the procedures of government, even when they are directly affected by them. Most

universities, Princeton included, have done little to educate people about such procedures. About this last fact, something can be done and should be.

We suggest three measures:

(1) That more information and more accurate information about the organization of the University and about its procedures for setting policy be published regularly in *The Undergraduate Announcement, The Graduate Announcement,* and the *General Catalogue.*

(2) That the organization of the University and its procedures for setting policy regularly be made a subject for discussion with freshmen, new graduate students, and new members of the faculty and staff.

(3) That the Administration encourage the hiring of student administrative assistants by both the academic and non-academic departments of the University.

Some obvious possibilities for publication in one or more of the University catalogues, and perhaps in a specially prepared handbook as well, are the Charter of the Council of the Princeton University Community, the Constitution of the Undergraduate Assembly, the Trustees' Statement of Policy on the Delegation of Authority, portions of the *Rules and Procedures of the Faculty,* portions of *Students and the University,* the procedures of the Judicial Committee, rules of conduct that are applicable to all members of the University community and to particular groups, and realistic accounts of the procedures for making decisions regarding the graduate and undergraduate curricula and regarding the appointment and advancement of faculty members. In proposing that departments be encouraged to hire students as administrative assistants, we are not suggesting that they be hired when there is no need for administrative assistance. When such a need exists, however, the hiring of students serves two good purposes in addition to satisfying that need: Students are given an opportunity to become familiar with the administrative operations of the University, and administrators are exposed to the viewpoints of students.

Important as it is for members of the University community to be generally familiar with the way in which the University functions, it is no less important that they be able to learn about cur-

rent issues of policy and to exchange views on such issues. In the last two years progress has been made toward realizing that objective. As we noted in our Introduction, open meetings, open hearings, and wide distribution of reports and other documents have become increasingly common. Moreover, Princeton's new institutions of government provide new opportunities for communication. The Council of the Princeton University Community, for example, is not only a deliberative and rule-making body but also a forum in which representatives of all the major groups of the University can raise issues and can learn what issues concern others. Nonetheless, more needs to be done. In particular, it is still more difficult than it needs to be to bring issues to the attention of the University community as a whole and harder than it should be for members of that community to get information about issues for themselves.

As partial remedies for these problems we suggest, first, that the Secretary of the University be responsible for seeing that documents relating to the government of the University are readily available at Firestone Library and at branch libraries for any member of the University community who wants to read them. The various libraries should each set aside a special section for the reports, resolutions, speeches, memoranda, and other documents the Secretary sends them, and the existence of these special sections should be well publicized.

Second, we think that the President, annually and early in the fall term, should report on the state of the University, suggesting the problems of most immediacy to it, in a public and joint meeting of the Council of the Princeton University Community, the Faculty, the Undergraduate Assembly, and the Staff Council. Other officers of the University should also regard it as a regular and important part of their duties to give members of the University community at large advance notice of the issues they expect to arise and those they think should be considered.

Third, we favor more frequent publication of the University's *Newsletter* and its distribution to students as well as to members of the faculty and staff. At present the *Newsletter* is a monthly publication of the Office of Public Information. When its first issue appeared last year, the *Newsletter* became the most widely circulated publication on campus. While that fact alone makes it a valuable addition to the University's network of communication,

the *Newsletter* suffers from its infrequent publication. Too much that has happened in a month has to go unreported and too much that is reported is old news. More frequent publication, possibly weekly, would enable the *Newsletter* to publish more material and would force it to be up-to-date.

But the *Newsletter* should not try to compete with the *Daily Princetonian*. The *Princetonian*, or other dailies, can attempt to gather and present all the news being made on the campus. That should not be the *Newsletter*'s goal. As a publication of the Administration, it should inform the community about what the Administration is doing and present the Administration's views on the problems and issues facing the University. It should also publish statements challenging the views of the Administration and otherwise encourage argument and debate on its pages.

As the only regular publication prepared by the Administration to inform the University community about issues and decisions, the *Newsletter* should be readily obtainable by all members of that community. It would not be necessary for each copy to be individually addressed and mailed; perhaps undergraduates could be reached through bulk delivery to dormitories and graduate students could receive their *Newsletters* through bulk delivery to their departmental mailboxes.

Fourth, we think that the *Daily Princetonian* should orient itself less toward the undergraduate body alone and more toward the entire University community. The wider participation in the government of the University becomes, the more urgent is the need for a *community* newspaper. We would, therefore, like to see the *Princetonian* expand the scope of its news coverage and commentary and address itself more than it does now to the interests of graduate students and of members of the faculty and staff. It might also incorporate members of those groups into its staff of reporters.

During its 94 years of publication, the *Princetonian* has, with varied skill and varied success, presented campus news to its readers. Needless to say, it has not always been the same kind of newspaper throughout its long life. Recently the *Princetonian* has considered all that happens at Princeton to be of legitimate interest to it. It has been an important instrument for change and has often and persistently called for greater openness in the making of de-

cisions and greater involvement in decision-making by members of the University community.

We think there is an opportunity now for the *Princetonian* to contribute to better communication among members of the University community. As an independent and student-run newspaper, there are limits to what the *Princetonian* can do and on what the University community can reasonably expect it to do, but we think it is reasonable to propose that more of the *Princetonian*'s news columns be devoted to coverage of the sometimes unspectacular but nonetheless important discussions that take place in the deliberative and governing bodies of the University. The paper could devote more of its editorial columns to solicited material written in support of competing candidates at election time or debating alternative views when major decisions are about to be made. The *Princetonian* could publish the times, places, and agenda of meetings of decision-making bodies. Annually, it could review the effectiveness of the University's arrangements for making decisions, and, in the issue sent to incoming freshmen, could contribute to informing new students about the process of government at Princeton. It might also consider an issue for new graduate students.

If it is to do these sorts of things, the *Princetonian* can use help. Members of the Administration, faculty, and student body should cooperate with the *Princetonian* in its search for news, remembering that the more information the paper has, the greater is the likelihood that it will publish full and accurate accounts of news events. More frequent press conferences and briefings would be one important way to help. Direct payment for the publication of important reports (or excerpts from them) would also be in order. The Council of the Princeton University Community set a precedent in this regard when it decided to publish all amendments to the Council's Charter as paid advertisements.

Our discussion of the *Princetonian* suggests another problem of communication which seems to us to be important: Many members of the University community are reluctant to give out information to the campus press because they fear mistaken or biased reporting. To alleviate such fear, and simultaneously to provide for more open discussion and more comprehensive reporting by the University's publications, we suggest that the *Princetonian* and all

other campus periodicals grant the right of reply to those about whom they report.[125]

In the form we propose it, the right to reply would give any person identified in a periodical that is published by members of the University community for distribution within the University community, the right to publish, free of charge, any correction or denial of material referring to him. The length of this reply would be limited but it would be guaranteed publication within a specified length of time and with display similar to the statement or article that provoked it. The *Newsletter* should adopt a policy of this kind, and, while the same policy could not be forced upon publications like the *Princetonian*, it is nonetheless quite consistent with the traditions of a free press. The *Princetonian* has already experimented with a similar policy, and we believe that it and other campus publications should find our more explicit version to be consistent both with lively journalism and the interests of an independent campus press.

[125] See Appendix 4, p. 125.

APPENDIX 1

PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE RULES AND PROCEDURES OF THE FACULTY OF PRINCETON UNIVERSITY[1]

GENERAL PROVISIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE FACULTY (pp. 15-23)

A. General Provisions in the Trustees' By-Laws (p. 15)

A. 1 The Faculty consists of the President, the Academic Officers, the Professors, the Associate Professors, the Assistant Professors, and when on full-time appointment the Lecturers and the Instructors. *All members of the Faculty are entitled to vote at meetings of the Faculty.*

A. 3 Lecturers, Instructors, Assistants in Instruction, holders of visiting appointments, and members of the Professional Research Staff are appointed by the President subject to review by the Trustees' Committee on the Curriculum and by the Board. [Those on full-time appointment are entitled to attend each meeting of the Faculty, but they are not entitled to vote, except as hereafter provided.] *When on full-time appointment, Assistants in Instruction, holders of visiting appointments, and members of the Professional Research Staff are entitled to attend each meeting of the Faculty but they are not entitled to vote, except as hereafter provided.*

B. Principles Governing Tenure (p. 16)

B. 2 [Proved ability as a scholar shall be one of the essential qualifications for recommendation for an associate professorship or professorship.] *Proved abilities as a teacher and scholar shall be essential qualifications for recommendation for an associate professorship or professorship; qualifications for making other contributions to the welfare of the University shall also be taken into account in making any such recommendation.*

[1] Text enclosed in square brackets indicates wording to be deleted from the original document.

Text printed in italic type, except titles of committees, indicates wording to be added to the original document.

C. Appointments and Advancements (p. 16)

C. 1 All proposals for appointment, reappointment, or advancement in rank or salary shall be made in writing by the chairman of the department concerned and sent to the Dean of the Faculty for transmission to the President. Proposals for appointment, reappointment, promotion, and change in salary of assistant professors, associate professors, and lecturers with rank of associate professor, shall normally be made only after formal consultation with those of higher professorial rank within the department[.], *and associate professors shall also normally be consulted with regard to the appointment of associate professors.* Proposals for change in salary of professors and lecturers with the rank of professors shall be made by the chairman of the department. Proposals for the appointment and reappointment of instructors, assistants in instruction, teaching fellows and others of similar rank and for the salary of instructors may be made by the chairman without formal consultation within the department. Proposals for appointment to the rank of lecturer and for reappointment and salary changes for persons in that rank shall normally be made only after formal consultation with the tenure members of the department concerned. In cases of joint appointment, action is taken in the two departments involved.

C. 2 (New provision) *Before forwarding proposals for the appointment, reappointment, or advances in rank and salary of faculty members, departmental chairmen shall normally invite the student departmental committees of their departments to express their views on the quality of instruction in their departments and on any other matters relevant to the appointment and advancement of faculty members, and shall normally advise these committees that they may forward to the Dean of the Faculty for transmission to the President (and where appropriate to the Faculty Advisory Committee on Appointments and Advancements) comments regarding the quality of teaching by individual members of the faculty.*

(Note: Paragraphs in Section C numbered 2 through 4 should be renumbered 3 through 5; otherwise they remain unchanged.)

C. 6 (formerly C. 5) In judging and recommending instructors and assistant professors for further appointment, departments,

without being bound by any rule of equivalence, shall take into account service in other institutions[.]; *and in judging and recommending any member of the faculty for advancement in rank or salary, or for further appointment, departments shall make the quality of his teaching and scholarship primary considerations and his service in the University community an important consideration.*

(Note: The remainder of Section C remains unchanged, except that paragraphs 6 through 10 should be renumbered 7 through 11.)

H. Meetings of the Faculty (p. 21)

H. 3 [Actions taken at a meeting of the Faculty are to be held as confidential until released by competent authority; and a member of the Faculty participating in a meeting has the right to assume that his utterances and votes will not be revealed to anyone outside of the membership of the Faculty.] *Meetings of the Faculty shall normally be open for attendance as observers to representatives of the campus press, to members of the Council of the Princeton University Community, and to such additional members of the University community (chosen randomly from among those who have indicated a desire to attend a particular meeting) as can be seated in the place set for a meeting. Members of University or Faculty committees, who have been invited to appear in connection with a committee report, and other guests who have been invited by the President or the Faculty, shall also normally be free to remain during the whole session to which they have been invited. However, those in attendance shall not attribute remarks made in discussion to particular members without their permission; all in attendance shall be bound to preserve the confidentiality of any portion of a meeting that has been designated confidential by a motion to that effect, duly approved; and, any session may be declared closed to observers, in whole or in part, on the vote of a two-thirds majority of the Faculty Advisory Committee on Policy or on the request of one-third of the members of the Faculty present and voting.*

H. 4 (New provision) *Actions taken when the Faculty meets in executive session are to be held as confidential until released*

by competent authority; and a member of the Faculty participating in a meeting held in executive session has the right to assume that his utterances and votes will not be revealed to to anyone outside the membership of the Faculty.

(Note: Paragraphs in Section H numbered 4 and 5 should be renumbered 5 and 6; otherwise they remain unchanged.)

H. 7 All important proposals should be delivered in writing to the Clerk not later than noon on the second Friday preceding the meeting at which they will be introduced, and the Clerk shall *normally* cause such proposals to be printed and distributed to the members of the Faculty, *to be made public and placed on file*, and to be placed on the Order of Business for that meeting, provided that no such proposal offered by an individual member shall be so treated unless it is seconded by another member.

(Note: Paragraphs in Section H numbered 7 and 8 should be renumbered 8 and 9; otherwise they remain unchanged.)

H. 10 (New provision) *The Faculty shall consider a second vote on any action taken on a proposal regarding the undergraduate curriculum when a second vote has been requested by the Undergraduate Assembly, and in any particular academic year commits itself to a second vote on any action on a proposal regarding the undergraduate curriculum when within two months after such action, a second vote has been requested by a two-thirds majority of the Undergraduate Assembly. If the action to be reconsidered is on a proposal that the Faculty has rejected, a majority vote of the Faculty shall reverse the previous decision. If the action to be reconsidered is on a proposal that has been adopted by the Faculty, a two-thirds vote of the Faculty shall be necessary to affirm the previous decision. The Faculty shall not be requested to reconsider the same action more than once in any academic year.*

PROVISIONS WITH REGARD TO COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY (pp. 23-37)

Much of the business of the Faculty is transacted through the agency of the standing committees listed and described below in sections A and C.

Membership in these committees is determined by the procedures outlined below. [In section B.]

Any committee of the Faculty may ask the President to arrange for a conference with any appropriate committee of the Board of Trustees.

When the Undergraduate Assembly shall establish a committee parallel to a Faculty Committee, these committees shall at least once a year meet in joint session. In addition, the chairman and one additional member of such committees of the Undergraduate Assembly shall meet with those Faculty committees which the President of the University and the officers of the Undergraduate Assembly feel would benefit from such participation. The student representatives on Faculty committees shall join freely in committee discussions of matters of concern to students, and shall be responsible for presenting the views of the student committee and the Undergraduate Assembly, when those views are known. Any student participating in the deliberations of a Faculty committee is bound by the same rules as the faculty regarding the confidential nature of the proceedings. Within the bounds of this restriction, he may discuss the matters under consideration with the Undergraduate Assembly or with other students. Either committee may meet without the participation of members of the parallel committee. Before any final recommendation is made on any matter of general policy concerning students, there will be an opportunity for the student committee to meet jointly with the Faculty committee involved. Views of the student committees may be brought to the attention of the full Faculty and the University community.

All students of the University have the right of appeal to the Faculty from action of any Faculty committee.

A. List of Standing Committees (p. 23)

Committee on Committees
Admission
Advisory Committee on Appointments and Advancements
Advisory Committee on Policy
Athletic Eligibility
Conference
Course of Study
Discipline
Examinations and Standing
Graduate School

[Honorary Degrees]
Library
Princeton University Conference
Public Lectures
[Public Speaking and Debate]
Schedule
Undergraduate Life
University Research Board
University Committee on Scholarships

B. Provisions with regard to Elections Procedures (p. 24)

B.1 For [the Advisory Committee on Policy] the Committee on Conference, the Committee on the Course of Study, and the University Research Board, the election procedures will be as follows:

B.1.3 On May 1, the Clerk will mail to each voting member of the Faculty ballots containing lists of the candidates for these Committees, the names to be grouped by Divisions and within each Division arranged alphabetically. [The Faculty will be instructed to vote for as many candidates as there are vacancies to be filled, and to return their ballots to the Clerk's office by noon of May 10, at which time the poll will be deemed closed.] *Brief statements describing the responsibilities of these Committees will also appear on the ballots. The Faculty will be instructed to rank all the candidates for each of these committees by order of preference, and to return their ballots to the Clerk's office by noon of May 10, at which time the poll will be deemed closed.*

B.1.4 [The Clerk will tabulate the results of this balloting. The candidates receiving the highest number of votes among the ballots cast will be considered elected to the vacant positions on the Committees designated, and will be reported as elected at the June meeting of the Faculty.] *The Clerk will tabulate the results of this balloting and report the results of the election at the June meeting of the Faculty.*

B.2 For the Advisory Committee on Appointments and Advancements, the election procedure shall be as follows:

B.2.1 On May 1st the Clerk shall mail to each member of the Faculty entitled to vote a nominating ballot containing the names of the deans of the schools and the departmental

chairmen on regular appointment for the next academic year. The names on the ballot will be grouped by divisions: I, The Humanities and Philosophy; II, The Social Sciences and History; III, The Natural Sciences and Mathematics; and IV, Engineering and Applied Science. The Faculty will be instructed to [vote for two (but not more than two) names in each of the four divisions] *rank the names in each division by order of preference* and to return the ballot to the Clerk's office before noon on May 10th, at which time the poll shall be deemed closed.

B.2.2 The Clerk shall tabulate the results of this balloting. [The candidate in a division who shall receive the highest number of votes, if it is a majority of the ballots counted, shall be considered elected and the presiding officer shall so declare at the June meeting of the Faculty.] *The winning candidate in each division shall be determined according to the system of the alternative vote, his selection being announced by the presiding officer at the June meeting of the Faculty.*

B.2.3 [If in any division no candidate receives a majority on the first balloting, or two or more candidates with a majority shall be tied, the Clerk will mail a second ballot on which shall be listed alphabetically the names of the two nominees in that division who have received the largest number of votes or the names of those with a majority vote who were tied for first place. In the event of a tie, but no majority, the list of nominees in a division will include the names of all those tied for first place or of whoever receives the highest vote and those tied for second place. The Faculty will be instructed to vote for one name in each division listed. This final ballot is to be mailed two weeks before the June meeting of the Faculty and is to be returned to the Clerk's office before noon on the Thursday next preceding that meeting or, if that Thursday shall fall on May 30th, before noon on Friday, May 31st, at which time the poll shall be deemed closed.]

B.2.4 (To be renumbered as B.2.3) [The candidate in any of the divisions on this second balloting who receives the highest number of votes, shall be considered elected.] In case of a tie vote, the President shall cast the deciding vote.

(Note: Paragraphs 5 and 6 remain unchanged, except they should be renumbered 4 and 5)

B.3. For each other Faculty committee, unless another procedure is indicated below *or elsewhere*, the Committee on Committees will nominate members to fill vacancies and will submit the nominations at the June meeting for action by the Faculty.

B.4. (New provision) *Any member of a committee may be recalled by the Faculty, and such recall vote shall be held upon petition of fifty members of the Faculty. A majority of votes cast for recall shall cause the recall of the member and his seat shall thereby become vacant.*

C. Provisions with regard to Structure and Duties (p. 26)

It shall be the duty of each chairman of a committee to advise new committee members of the responsibilities and procedures of his committee. All standing committees of the Faculty shall report annually to the Faculty, giving an account of their activities, together with any proposals they may have with regard to the matters within their charge or with regard to their own responsibilities.

C.1 *Committee on Committees*

C.1. The Committee on Committees consists of the President (chairman) and [four members of the Faculty, one from each of the four Divisions of the University (Humanities, Social Sciences, Natural Sciences, and Engineering and Applied Science). Each year, ordinarily at the February meeting, the Faculty elects, on nomination from the floor, one of its members to serve for a term of four years from the date of his election and, in case of a further vacancy, elects one of its members to fill the unexpired term. A member of the Faculty who has completed a term of four years shall not be eligible for re-election to the Committee until after the expiration of four years.] *and one tenured and one non-tenured member of the Faculty from each of the four Divisions of the University (Humanities, Social Sciences, Natural Sciences, and Engineering and Applied Science). Faculty members serving on the Com-*

mittee will be appointed by the Faculty Advisory Committee on Policy, with the consent of the Faculty.

C.2 *Admission*

C.2.1 The Committee on Admissions consists of the Director of Admission, the Dean of the College, the Dean of Students, the Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science or his representative, the Director of the Bureau of Student Aid, and six elected members of the Faculty, of whom at least one is drawn from each of the four academic Divisions, *and at least two from among the non-tenured faculty*. The Director of Admission is chairman of the Committee.

C.4 *Advisory Committee on Policy*

C.4.2 The Advisory Committee on Policy consists of [seven members of the Faculty, of whom at least one is drawn from each of the four Divisions of the University, and of whom, normally, not more than three are elected by the Faculty between May 1 and the June meeting to serve for a term of three years.], *the six members of the Faculty elected by the Faculty to represent it on the Executive Committee of the Council of the Princeton University Community.*

C.5 *Athletic Eligibility*

C.5.1 The Committee on Athletic Eligibility consists of the Dean of Students (who acts as secretary), the secretary of the Committee on Examinations and Standing *ex officio*, the chairman of the Department of Health, the Director of Athletics, and six members of the Faculty [(one of the latter of whom is designated by the President to serve as chairman).], *of whom at least two are drawn from among the non-tenured faculty. A member of the Faculty is designated by the President to serve as chairman.* The Committee on Athletic Eligibility has authority to make and administer, subject to approval by the Faculty, rules governing the eligibility of the members of any athletic team representing Princeton University. It functions as a Subcommittee of the University Council on Athletics.

C.6 *Conference*

C.6.1 [The Committee on Conference attends a conference

with the Trustees' Committee on Curriculum before each stated meeting of the Board, to discuss such subjects as may be presented involving both administrative and educational matters.] *The Committee on Conference normally meets with the Trustees' Committee on Curriculum at least twice each year before stated meetings of the Board, to discuss such subjects as may be presented including both administrative and educational matters.* The Committee on Conference, after consultation with the President, may also confer with any other committee of the Board of Trustees.

C.6.4 (New provision) *The Conference Committee, in addition to the responsibilities described above, hears and decides cases involving alleged violations by members of the Faculty of rules applicable only or mainly to members of the Faculty and over such other cases involving Faculty members as are not within the jurisdiction of the Judicial Committee of the Council of the Princeton University Community.*

C.6.5 The Committee on Conference consists of [six members of the Faculty, of whom two are elected by the Faculty each year between May 1 and the June meeting to serve for a term of three years] *of nine members of the Faculty. Each year between May 1 and the June meeting the Faculty elects to the Committee two tenured members of the Faculty, with voting being according to the system of the single transferable vote, and one non-tenured member of the Faculty, with voting being according to the system of the alternative vote. Members are elected to terms of three years.*

C.7 *Course of Study*

C.7.1 The Committee on the Course of Study considers and recommends to the Faculty appropriate action on all matters connected with the educational policy of the undergraduate program. Among the matters with which it is particularly concerned are the following:

1. Requirements for admission to the University.
2. Requirements for all bachelors' degrees.
3. Methods of instruction, programs of study, and regulations concerning scholastic standing.

4. The institution of new courses and the modification of existing courses in the undergraduate curriculum.
5. *The promotion, monitoring, and publicizing of experiments in teaching.*

C.7.4 The Dean of the College is *ex officio* chairman of this Committee, the Dean of the Faculty is *ex officio* a member, and an Assistant Dean of the College is *ex officio* secretary. In addition there are nine members of the Faculty elected by the Faculty between May 1 and the June meeting. [At least two elected members are drawn from each of the four Divisions of the University.] *At least one tenured member of the Faculty and one non-tenured member of the Faculty are drawn from each of the four Divisions of the University, and all nine members shall be elected according to the system of the alternative vote.* Three members are elected each year to terms of three years. The Provost meets with this Committee when necessary.

C.9 *Examinations and Standing*

C.9.1 The Committee on Examinations and Standing consists of eight Faculty members, at least one from each Division, *and at least two from among the members of the non-tenured faculty.* The Dean of the College is chairman *ex officio*, the Dean of Students, the Registrar, and the Director of Admission (*or his representative*) are members *ex officio*, and an Assistant Dean of the College is secretary *ex officio.* The Committee is entrusted with the administration of all regulations which concern the program of study and the scholastic standing of undergraduate students. It may present to the Committee on the Course of Study proposals for changes in these regulations.

C.9.4 *It nominates each year to the Faculty during the spring term, a candidate for the post of Latin Salutatorian, and a candidate for the post of Valedictorian, under the rules set forth in the Undergraduate Announcement in connection with the selection of Commencement speakers.*

C.10 *Graduate School*

C.10.4 The Graduate School Committee has three Subcommittees: The Subcommittee on Policy, the Subcommittee on Student Life, and the Subcommittee on Fellowships and

Financial Aid. [Each of these Subcommittees] *The Subcommittee on Student Life and the Subcommittee on Fellowship and Financial Aid each* consists of the Dean of the Graduate School (chairman), the Associate Dean of the Graduate School (secretary), and four members of the full Committee appointed by the Dean, one each from the four Divisions of the University. *The Subcommittee on Policy consists of the Dean of the Graduate School as chairman, the Associate Dean of the Graduate School as secretary, and four members of the full Committee, one from each of the four Divisions of the University, elected by the Committee according to the system of the alternative vote between May 1 and the June meeting of the Faculty. In elections to the Policy Subcommittee the names on the ballot will be grouped by Divisions and the names of all members of the Graduate School Committee shall appear. In the case of a tie vote, the Dean of the Graduate School shall cast the deciding vote.*

C.10.5 To the Subcommittee on Policy the Committee often refers for preliminary investigation and formulation major questions before it for consideration; at least once a year, this Subcommittee on Policy and the Committee on the Course of Study meet in joint session to discuss overall questions of educational policy. The Subcommittee on Student Life is concerned with all matters relating to the nonacademic aspects of graduate student life. The Subcommittee on Fellowships and Financial Aid acts as an executive body in judging recommendations for competitive fellowships.

C.11 [*Honorary Degrees*

The Committee on Honorary Degrees meets with the Trustees' Committee on Honorary Degrees on the invitation of that Committee. It consists of four members, one from each Division, of whom no more than two are elected each year to serve for a term of three years.]

C.12 *Library*

C.12.1 The Committee on the Library consists of *two members of the Professional Research Staff and* six elected Faculty members, including one from each Division of the University[.] *and two drawn from among the members*

of the non-tenured faculty. The Librarian is chairman *ex officio*, the Associate Librarian is secretary *ex officio*, the Provost and the Dean of the Faculty are members *ex officio.*

C.13 *Princeton University Conference*

C.13.2 The Committee consists of [two representatives from each of the four Divisions of the University] *one tenured and one non-tenured member of the Faculty from each of the four Divisions of the University* and the Administrative Director of the Princeton University Conference Office, *ex officio.* The Assistant Directors of the Conference Office and the Directors of the Office of Research and Project Administration and the Development Office, or their representatives, attend meetings in an advisory capacity, without vote.

C.14 *Public Lectures*

C.14.1 The Committee consists of [ten] *eight* Faculty members, including at least one from each of the four Divisions *and at least three who are non-tenured*, and the Director of the Princeton University Press [or his representative *ex officio*], *the Dean of the College, and the Dean of the Graduate School, or their representatives* ex officio.

C.15 *Public Speaking and Debate*

(Entire section to be deleted)

C.16 *Schedule*

The Committee consists of eight Faculty members, two from each Division of the University *and at least two who are non-tenured.* [one of whom is chairman.] The Registrar is secretary *ex officio*, and the Dean of the College is a member *ex officio.* The Chairman is designated by the President[.] *from among the elected members of the Faculty.*

C.17 *Undergraduate Life*

C.17.1 The Committee on Undergraduate Life is concerned with relationships between the intellectual and social life of undergraduates. [The responsibilities of the Committee include (in consultation with the appropriate student and trustee committees) the definition and general oversight of rules and regulations affecting undergraduate life. It is entrusted also with the general supervision of all undergraduate organizations not under the jurisdiction of another

Faculty committee.] It may advise the President or make recommendations to the Faculty on all matters concerned with non-academic aspects of undergraduate life, *including organizations of concern to undergraduates*, and will report from time to time to the Faculty on matters under its charge, particularly where these bear on University policy.

C.17.2 The Committee consists of [up to ten elected members of the Faculty (at least two from each Division)] *of one tenured and one non-tenured member of the Faculty from each of the four Divisions of the University* and, in addition, the following members of the administration: the Dean of Students (chairman), the Dean of the College, the Secretary of the Board of Advisers, and the Director of Athletics. The Assistant Dean of Students (sitting without vote) serves as secretary.

C.17.3 The Committee will normally include in its deliberations, and in the work of any subcommittees which may develop, student representatives designated by the Undergraduate Assembly, and normally at least once a year the Committee will meet with the Trustees' Committee on Student Life.

C.18 *University Research Board*

C.18.2 The University Research Board consists of six members of the Faculty: two elected by the Faculty *by the system of the alternative vote*, and four appointed by the President. Each of the four Divisions of the Faculty is represented by at least one member. In addition, there is a chairman and an executive officer appointed by the President. The Financial Vice-President and Treasurer is a member *ex officio* of the Board. The Provost, the Dean of the Faculty and the Dean of the Graduate School meet with the Board when necessary.

The four members of the Board appointed by the President to represent the Faculty, and the two members at large elected by the Faculty, serve for terms of four years, and are not eligible for immediate re-election or reappointment after serving a full four-year term, except in unusual circumstances. *A member shall normally be elected at large every other year.*

C.19 *University Committee on Scholarships*

C.19.1 The University Committee on Scholarships consists of the Dean of the College (chairman), the Dean of the Faculty, [the Secretary of the University,] the Financial Vice-President and Treasurer, and [two] four members of the Faculty appointed by the President, one from each Division of the University, *and at least one who is non-tenured.*

B. Provisions with regard to Departmental Organization (p. 38)

B.2 The chairman of a department is appointed by the President for a term of three years, *normally after consultation with the members of the departmental faculty concerned.* The duties of the chairman of a department are:

a. To call and preside over all meetings of the department.

b. To bring to the attention of the department for discussion and action all matters which may pertain to the work and efficiency of the department.

c. To represent the department in all administrative dealings with the President of the University.

d. To bring to the Faculty for consideration all proposals of the department requiring Faculty approval.

e. To perform such other duties in connection with the work and administration of the department as the President of the University may assign him.

XIV. Provisions with regard to Research Supported by Outside Funds (pp. 62-66)

C. Administration and Procedures (pp. 63-64)

C.2.2 After appropriate review of proposals in accordance with the policies adopted by the University Research Board, *as augmented by such guidelines as may be developed by the Council of the Princeton University Community,* formal proposals to outside sponsors will normally be transmitted through the Office of Research and Project Administration. Any negotiation necessary to consummate an arrangement or contract with the sponsor will also normally be handled through that Office.

E. *Procedures for Reviewing Individual Projects and Departmental Sponsored Research Programs* (pp. 65-66)

E.3 Prior to formal submission, proposals or grants for sponsored research (other than those covered in paragraph 2, above) will normally be reviewed by subgroups of the Board, composed of a minimum of two members, one to be selected from the non-science and the other from the science-engineering membership. Proposals having broad or unusual implications will be reviewed by the Board as a whole. *The Chairman of the Research Board will also report such cases to the Executive Committee of the Council of the Princeton University Community*. The Board reserves the first and third Wednesdays for meetings during each month of the academic year, subject to call.

Members of the Faculty considering the solicitation of outside funds for research in which they are interested are urged to study the above statement and to consult with the Office of Research and Project Administration.

E.4 (New provision) *The Chairman of the Research Board shall from time to time report to the Council of the Princeton University Community on issues of policy before the Board.*

APPENDIX 2

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNDERGRADUATE ASSEMBLY[1]

ARTICLE I. Name and Purposes

I.B.4 [To exercise leadership in the extra-curricular activities.] *To exercise leadership in all activities affecting the life of the undergraduates of Princeton University.*

I.B.5 (New provision) *To exercise those responsibilities delegated to it by official University policy-making bodies.*

ARTICLE III. Officers

III.B.1 The President of the Undergraduate Assembly shall preside at all meetings of the Executive [Board] *Committee*; *serve as Chairman of the Assembly*; establish the agenda for meetings of the Executive [Board] *Committee* and the Assembly; [appoint students to be members of such faculty and other University committees as are appropriate; appoint the staff of the Assembly;] appoint temporary committees of the Assembly; and call special meetings of the Assembly at his discretion or upon written request of five members. [All appointments made by the President shall be subject to ratification by a majority of the Assembly.]

III.B.2 The Vice-President shall [serve as Chairman of the Assembly;] assist the President in his duties; *and assume the duties of the President in case of recall of the President from office until a new election can be held as stipulated in ARTICLE VIII below, or in case of death, absence, or disability of the President.*

III.B.3 The Secretary shall record and publish the minutes of all Undergraduate Assembly meetings and publish the agenda for all meetings as provided in [ARTICLE VI, C-E] *ARTI-*

[1] Text enclosed in square brackets indicates wording to be deleted from the original document.

Text printed in italic type indicates wording to be added to the original document.

CLE V, C-D, below; attend to all necessary correspondence; serve as secretary to the Executive Committee; serve as Chairman of the Undergraduate Assembly Staff; *report promptly all actions and decisions of the Executive Committee to the Assembly; and communicate the actions and deliberations of the Assembly and Executive Committee to the student body.*

III.B.4 The Treasurer shall receive and disburse the funds of the Assembly, *subject to the approval of the Assembly, and present regular financial reports to the Assembly.* [The Treasurer shall be accountable to the Assembly for all expenditures made out of Assembly funds.]

ARTICLE IV. Powers of the Assembly

IV.C [The Assembly shall have the power of approval over all appointments made by the President as provided in ARTICLE III, Section B above.] *The Assembly shall have the power to make all appointments to committees, except to such temporary committees as may be established by the President. Nominations will normally be presented by the Executive Committee; however, additional nominations may also be made from the floor of the Assembly by other members of the Assembly.*

ARTICLE V. Meetings

V.A The Assembly shall hold regularly scheduled meetings twice each calendar month beginning with the [fourth week] *second week* in October and continuing through the first week in May, except for vacations and examination periods. Additional meetings may be called for under the provisions of ARTICLE III, Section B above.

V.B All regularly scheduled meetings may be open and public. [A special meeting may be declared closed at the request of ten members of the Assembly.] *The Assembly reserves the right to declare itself in Executive Session during any meeting.*

ARTICLE VI. The Executive Committee

VI.A The Executive Committee of the Undergraduate Assembly shall be composed of the four officers of the Assembly, [and the three officers from each of the four undergraduate classes.

It shall be chaired by the President of the Assembly.] *and five members of the Assembly, elected by the method of the single transferable vote from within the Assembly at the first regularly scheduled meeting of the Assembly following each election for Dormitory Representatives.*

VI.B The Executive Committee shall have the power to initiate discussion, deliberate, and vote on any question which may be brought before the Assembly as stipulated in ARTICLE IV, Section A, above; *nominate students to be members of such faculty, student, and other University committees as are appropriate; and establish and appoint, on the recommendation of the President, an Undergraduate Assembly Staff to assist it in its duties.*

VI.C The Executive Committee shall [at all times] be responsible to the Assembly. [Discussion of any question voted on by the Executive Committee may be reopened by the Assembly, and the decision of the Executive Committee may be reinforced or reversed by a simple majority vote of the Assembly.] *Any question voted on by the Executive Committee may be reopened by the Assembly, and any decision of the Executive Committee may be affirmed or reversed by a simple majority vote of the Assembly.*

VI.D Meetings of the Executive Committee [shall] *may* be called by the President of the Assembly *at his discretion* or *shall be called by him* upon the request of two members of the Executive Committee.

VI.E [The Executive Committee shall be responsible for discharging the administrative duties of the Assembly. It shall be assisted in these duties by an Undergraduate Assembly Staff appointed by the President and headed by the Secretary of the Assembly.]

ARTICLE VII. Elections and Terms of Office
(Amended March 17, 1969)

VII.A *If they are necessary to limit the number of candidates to two for each office,* preliminary elections for the four Officers of the Assembly shall be held on the [third Tuesday after Spring vacation] *second Tuesday of the spring term, with*

voting being according to the system of the single transferable vote. The final elections shall be held on the following Tuesday. [No more than three] *No more than two* candidates for each Assembly office shall appear on the final ballot. That candidate for each Assembly office shall be elected who shall receive the largest number of the votes cast for that position. In the event of a tie vote, a run-off election shall be held on the Friday following the regular election. The Officers of the Assembly shall take office at the first regularly scheduled meeting of the Undergraduate Assembly following the election, and shall serve until the corresponding meeting of the following year.

VII.B *If they are necessary to limit the number of candidates to two for each office,* preliminary elections for the President, Vice-President, and Secretary-Treasurer of each class (*except the Freshman Class*) shall be held [on the third Tuesday after Spring vacation] *on the second Tuesday of the spring term,* and those for the Officers of the incoming Freshman Class on the first Tuesday in [December] *November and then again on the third Tuesday after Spring vacation,* [if they are necessary to limit the number of candidates to three for each office] *with voting being according to the system of the single transferable vote.* The final elections shall be held on the Tuesday immediately following the preliminary elections. Candidates must run for one specific office. [No more than three] *No more than two* candidates for each position shall appear on the final ballot. The candidate for each office shall be elected who shall receive the largest number of votes for that office. In the event of a tie vote, a run-off election shall be held on the Friday following the regular election. The President, Vice-President, and Secretary-Treasurer elected in April by the Freshman [and Sophomore classes] Class shall take office at the first regularly scheduled meeting of the Assembly following the election and shall serve until [the corresponding meeting the following year] the first regularly scheduled meeting after the Officers of the Assembly shall have been elected in the following year. *The President, Vice-President, and Secretary-Treasurer elected in February by the Sophomore Class shall take*

office at the first regularly scheduled meeting following the election and shall serve until the corresponding meeting the following year. The President, Vice-President, and Secretary-Treasurer elected in [April] *February* by the Junior Class shall take office at the first regularly scheduled meeting of the Assembly following the election and shall serve until their class graduates from the University. The President, Vice-President, and Secretary-Treasurer elected in [December] *November* by the Freshman class shall take office at the first regularly scheduled meeting of the Assembly following their election and shall serve until the first regularly scheduled meeting following the next April's [class officer elections] *election of officers by Freshmen.*

VII.C Delete entire provision formerly designated VII.C (amended) and substitute:

Elections of Dormitory Representatives shall be held twice a year; elections for all Dormitory Representatives shall be held on the first Tuesday in October and on the second Tuesday of the spring term. That candidate shall be elected who receives a majority of the votes cast, as determined by the method of the alternative vote. In the event of a tie vote, a run-off election shall be held on the Thursday following the regular elections. Elected representatives shall take office at the first regularly scheduled meeting of the Assembly following the elections. Representatives elected in October shall serve until the first regularly scheduled meeting after the February elections; representatives elected in February shall serve until after the last Assembly meeting of the academic year.

VII.D (New provision) *If any Dormitory Representative, Class Officer, or Officer of the Assembly other than the President shall resign his post before the completion of his term, an election to fill the resultant vacancy shall be held in the manner described above for the post in question, within at least one week after the resignation is officially submitted to the Assembly Secretary.*

(Note: Provisions formerly designated D through G of Article VII should be re-designated E through H; otherwise they remain unchanged).

ARTICLE IX. Referendum Procedures
(New provision)

IX.A *Any resolution considered by the Executive Committee or by the Assembly may be referred to the entire undergraduate student body upon request of two-fifths of the membership of the Assembly, or upon petition of 200 undergraduates.*

IX.B *The wording of any resolution to be so referred shall not be altered.*

IX.C *The Executive Committee shall be charged with the responsibility of conducting any referendum and of reporting results.*

IX.D *The position taken by the Assembly on any resolution so referred shall be that of the majority of those voting in the referendum, provided that at least one-half of the undergraduate students regularly enrolled shall have voted.*

(Provision formerly designated ARTICLE IX shall be retained and shall be designated ARTICLE X.)

By-Laws of the Undergraduate Assembly

1. The parliamentary procedure at meetings of the Undergraduate Assembly is that of *Roberts' Rules of Order Revised*, with the following modifications:

1.a To Section 36. A motion to reconsider may be moved at the meeting in which the original vote was taken, or at the next meeting, by anyone present when the vote was taken who did not vote in the minority.

1.b To Section 58. The presiding officer shall have the same right of debate as other members, and need not yield the chair while speaking.

1.c To Sections 7 and 42. The maker of a motion shall be permitted to close the debate on that motion even after the previous question has been voted. A member may speak a second time on a motion in order to clear a matter of fact, or to explain himself in some material part of his first speech.

1.d In the course of general debate on a motion, or general discussion in the Assembly, the Chair may call on non-members as well as members of the Assembly to give their views.

2. All committees of the Assembly and all appointees of the Assembly to faculty, student, and other University committees

shall report on their activities to the Assembly upon request of the Executive Committee.

3. All important proposals shall normally be delivered in writing to the Assembly Secretary no later than noon on the Friday preceding the meeting at which they will be introduced. The Secretary shall cause such proposals to be printed and distributed to the members of the Assembly no later than noon on the Monday preceding the meeting at which they will be introduced.

APPENDIX 3

PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH THE OFFICE OF UNIVERSITY OMBUDSMAN

Resolved,

That Princeton University should establish the office of University Ombudsman, on the understanding that the Ombudsman's duties, powers, and appointment will be as described below, and that the need for the office will be reviewed within two and one half years after it shall have been established:

1

DUTIES AND POWERS

1.1 The University Ombudsman and his office shall act as a source of information about the functioning of the University, and especially about services provided by the University.

1.2 The University Ombudsman shall consider complaints and grievances brought to him by any member of the University community, and may investigate the conditions giving rise to such complaints. He may refer cases to others when the usual appeals procedures seem adequate, and will normally undertake independent investigation only if the usual procedures are inadequate or have been exhausted.

1.3 As a result of his investigations he may recommend action to any officer of the University, or to any committee or organization of the University.

1.4 He shall regularly meet both with the Committee on Rights and Rules and with the Committee on Governance of the Council of the Princeton University Community.

1.5 He shall from time to time report on his work to the Council of the Princeton University Community. He may also make public the results of his investigations.

1.6 He shall insure that any records pertaining to individuals are kept confidential, following the policy adopted by the Faculty on October 7, 1968, as part of the document *Students and the*

University. The same protection is understood to extend to the records of any member of the University community.

2

APPOINTMENT

2.1 Any member of the University may be nominated, or may nominate himself, for the position of University Ombudsman. Such nominations shall be addressed to the Executive Committee of the Council of the Princeton University Community. Nominations may also arise within the Executive Committee.

2.3 The Ombudsman shall be appointed by the Executive Committee of the Council of the Princeton University Community with the consent of the Council, a two-thirds majority of all members of the Council being necessary to confirm appointment. Every effort should be made to insure that the University Ombudsman has the widest approval of all constituencies in the University community.

2.4 The appointment shall be for a term of three years.

2.5 The University Ombudsman shall be removed from office only in case of disability, or for neglect of duty, or for malfeasance, and only by a two-thirds majority of all members of the Council of the Princeton University Community.

APPENDIX 4

PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH THE RIGHT OF REPLY

Resolved,

That editors and publishers of periodicals published by members of the University community for distribution within it should be requested to grant the right of reply in the manner and circumstances stated below:

1. If, in any newspaper or other periodical published by members of the University community for distribution within it, any matter is published regarding a person named or otherwise designated in such a manner as to be identified, the editor or publisher will publish, free of charge, any correction or denial of the matter that may be received from the person named or designated, *provided*:
   a) the denial or correction is signed by the person making it;
   b) the denial or correction does not exceed 250 words;
   c) the denial or correction is made and presented by mail or otherwise to the editor or publisher within one week after the original publication.
2. The denial or correction will be printed in full, and will not be edited or abridged, except that libelous and obscene statements may be removed.
3. It will be published, in the case of daily publications, within one week of its receipt, and in the case of other publications in the next or next succeeding issue.
4. It will be given a like position and space and as much display as had the statement or article which provoked it.
5. If any reply or denial exceeds 250 words in length, it will be considered as an ordinary letter to the editor, subject to editing or abridgement as the editor or publisher sees fit.

APPENDIX 5

A PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH THE COMMITTEE ON THE FUTURE OF THE UNIVERSITY

Resolved,

That the Council of the Princeton University Community should establish as a standing committee, the Committee on the Future of the University, its responsibilities and membership to be as described below:

1. The Committee on the Future of the University shall consider how Princeton University may, in the long-run, most effectively promote and disseminate learning, and, at least once annually, it shall report its discussions to the Council, together with any proposals it may have for action by the Council, or by other bodies, or by any officer of the University.

2. The Committee on the Future of the University shall consist of the President of the University; the Provost; the Dean of the Graduate School; the Dean of the College; two members of the faculty; two graduate students; two undergraduate students; and one member from one of the other groups represented on the Council. Those of its members not serving *ex officio* shall among them represent the four Divisions of the University.

APPENDIX 6

ADDITIONAL PROPOSALS

Part I

Procedures for Setting Policy

The Undergraduate Course of Study

We recommend:

1. That means be devised to permit departments to apply some savings of teaching time to enriching their undergraduate programs and to rewarding the efforts of instructors to develop new courses and methods of teaching.

(pp. 12-13)

2. That student departmental committees and departmental chairmen be jointly responsible for adopting procedures for the election of student departmental committees that have these objectives:
   (a) It should be convenient for the students of the department to vote.
   (b) There should be an opportunity for any departmental student to place names in nomination.
   (c) It should be easy for relatively small groups of students to have *a* representative on their department's committee and difficult for an organized minority to capture a disproportionate share of committee positions.
   (d) There should be reasonable precautions against multiple balloting and reasonable measures to insure a fair count of the vote.

(p. 18)

3. That departmental chairmen be responsible for:
   (a) Referring all proposals for changes in departmental undergraduate programs to their student committees before action on such proposals is taken by departmental faculties.
   (b) Inviting members of student committees to discuss proposals for changes in departmental undergraduate programs with departmental faculties at or before any

meetings in which departmental faculties take action on such proposals.

(c) Scheduling at least two meetings each academic year with their student committees, one early in the fall term to work out plans for later consultation, and one in late spring to review departmental undergraduate offerings so that chairmen may take student views into account in preparing requests for new staff.

(p. 19)

4. That student committees and faculty departmental committees concerned with the undergraduate program (in departments in which the latter sort of committee exists) normally meet jointly.

(p. 19)

5. That student departmental committees have the following additional prerogatives:

(a) The right to attach comments, favorable or unfavorable, to all proposals forwarded by the faculties of their departments to the Committee on the Course of Study.

(b) A reasonable amount of secretarial and other assistance in preparing proposals, communicating with departmental majors, and conducting elections.

(c) The right in certain circumstances to secure a departmental faculty's reconsideration of action taken on proposals regarding the course of study for undergraduate students. Specifically: Departmental faculties should seriously consider a second vote on any measure regarding the department's undergraduate program, when a second vote is requested by the student committee of the department. In any particular academic year departmental faculties should commit themselves to a second vote on such measures if a second vote is requested within one month by the student committee in a petition endorsed by two-thirds of the department's majors. If the action being reconsidered is on a proposal that the departmental faculty has rejected, a majority vote of the departmental faculty should reverse the previous decision. If the action being reconsidered is on a proposal that has been adopted by the departmental faculty, a two-thirds vote of the departmental faculty should be required to affirm the previous deci-

sion. Departmental faculties should not be bound to reconsider the same action more than once in the same academic year.

(pp. 20-21)

6. That the Academic Committee of the Undergraduate Assembly, or a subcommittee thereof, normally meet jointly with the Faculty Committee on the Course of Study, so long as the student committee remains at about its present size (5 members). Student members of the UGA Committee should have the same privileges which students who now sit with the Committee on the Course of Study enjoy (as these are defined in *Students and the University*, October 7, 1968, pp. 10-11), and shall have the right to attach comments to any proposals forwarded to the Faculty by the Committee on the Course of Study and to appear at meetings of the Faculty to present the views of the student committee on such proposals.

(pp. 21-22)

The Graduate Course of Study

We recommend:

1. That each department establish a departmental committee of graduate students, to act as a liaison between the faculty and the graduate student body of the department. Each committee should normally meet with the committee of the departmental faculty concerned with graduate studies, if one exists. The committee of graduate students should have the right to initiate discussion of any proposals relating to the departmental graduate program, should encourage students to participate in departmental affairs of special interest and relevance to them, and should have the following additional prerogatives:
   (a) The right to attach comments to all proposals forwarded to the Committee on the Graduate School by a departmental faculty.
   (b) A reasonable amount of secretarial and other assistance in preparing proposals, communicating with departmental graduate students, and conducting elections for the departmental committee.
   (c) The right in certain circumstances to secure a departmental faculty's reconsideration of action taken on pro-

posals regarding the graduate curriculum. Departments should seriously consider a second vote on any measure regarding the department's graduate program when it is requested by the student committee. In any particular academic year departmental faculties should commit themselves to a second vote on such measures if a second vote is requested within one month by the student departmental committee in a petition endorsed by two-thirds of the department's graduate students. If the action being reconsidered is on a proposal that the departmental faculty has rejected, a majority vote of the departmental faculty should reverse the previous decision. If the action being reconsidered is on a proposal that has been adopted by the departmental faculty, a two-thirds vote of the departmental faculty should be required to affirm the previous decision. Departmental faculties should not be bound to reconsider the same action more than once in the same academic year.

(pp. 25-26)

2. That each departmental chairman be responsible for:
   (a) Referring all proposals for changes in his department's graduate program to the departmental graduate student committee before action on such proposals by the faculty of his department.
   (b) Inviting student committee members to discuss proposals for changes in the graduate course of study with the faculty of his department at or before any meetings in which the departmental faculty proposes to take action on such proposals.

(pp. 25-26)

   (c) Scheduling at least two meetings each academic year with the graduate student committee of his departments, one early in the fall term to work out plans for later consultation, and one in late spring to review the department's graduate offerings so that chairmen may take student views into account in preparing requests for new staff.

(pp. 25-26)

3. That a properly constituted, University-wide organization of graduate students have the right to attach comments to pro-

posals regarding the graduate course of study being forwarded to the Faculty, the right to send representatives to meetings of the Faculty to speak for or against such proposals, and the right, upon a two-thirds vote of its members, to obtain a second vote by the Faculty on any decision about the graduate curriculum. The Faculty would not be bound, however, to reconsider the same action more than once in the same academic year.

(pp. 26-27)

Appointment and Advancement of Faculty Members

We recommend:

1. That the Dean of the Graduate School be responsible for developing procedures to survey the views of graduate students on the quality of their instruction.

(p. 34)

2. That departmental chairmen regularly invite both graduate and undergraduate student departmental committees to attach comments to any requests for authorization to seek new staff positions (as these are defined in terms of academic specialties) being forwarded by their departments to the Dean of the Faculty.

(p. 35)

3. That the Dean of the Faculty—working with the Dean of the College, the Committee on the Course of Study, and the Academic Committee of the Undergraduate Assembly—devise regular ways to make a limited number of extra-departmental appointments of limited term.

(p. 35)

4. That the Administration seek to ascertain in a systematic way the views of non-tenured faculty members on the manner in which decisions on appointments and advancements are made in their departments.

(p. 37)

Affiliations with Organizations, the Leasing of Campus Property

We recommend

1. That the Executive Committee of the Council of the Princeton University Community (and, at that group's discretion, the Council itself) review leases of campus property, or the

renewal of such leases, before final decisions are made with regard to them.
(pp. 41-42)

Rules of Conduct

We recommend:

1. That a University-wide body representing graduate students (or, if such a body is not established within a reasonable length of time, the Dean of the Graduate School in consultation with the Committee on Rights and Rules of the Council of the Princeton University Community) develop procedures to insure procedural protections for graduate students accused of violating rules.
(pp. 44-45)
2. That the Undergraduate Assembly and Dean of Students examine the present arrangements with regard to the composition and status of the Committee on Discipline, and forward proposals for any changes in these to the Committee on Rights and Rules of the Council of the Princeton University Community for review and presentation to the Council and the Faculty.
(p. 45)
3. That the Committee on Rights and Rules of the Council of the Princeton University Community review the University's rules of conduct with these objectives in mind:
   (a) All discriminatory applications of rules to particular groups within the University community should be eliminated, unless the nature of the offense described by the rule provides a reasonable basis for such discrimination.
   (b) Members of the University community should be able to find out easily and in reasonably precise terms the kinds of conduct enjoined by the University and the possible penalties that may attach to violations of particular rules.
   (c) A serious and sustained effort should be made to attach to particular kinds of misconduct penalties more appropriate than many of those now exacted.
(pp. 46-47)

Conflicts of Interest

We recommend:

1. That the University develop rules and procedures for disqualifying members of the University community from participation in any University decision from which they derive substantial personal advantage or in whose outcome they have a substantial economic interest.

(p. 49)

2. That individual members of the University community be obligated to raise issues regarding the propriety of their own participation in decisions, have access to confidential advice on the merits of such issues, and be finally responsible for deciding whether or not to disqualify themselves.

(p. 49)

3. That, if a member of the University community disqualifies himself from participation in a decision, it be made a matter of public record, and that, if a member of the University community is requested not to disqualify himself by officers of the University or the body charged with responsibility for a decision, that fact also be made a matter of public record.

(p. 49)

4. That the President, in consultation with the Board of Trustees, and members of the Administration, Faculty, Professional Research Staff, and Professional Technical Staff, establish advisory committees on problems relating to conflicts of interest, one for the Trustees and one for the other groups, which shall be responsible for developing and implementing rules and procedures for disqualification, for offering opinions on the desirability of disqualification in particular cases, and for reviewing the adequacy of rules, procedures, and policies for disqualification; and that such committees be small, have ready access to legal advice, and have their members chosen with regard to continuity of the membership of each committee.

(pp. 49-50)

Part II

The Organization of the University

The Board of Trustees

We recommend:

1. That the Board of Trustees make changes in arrangements as described in the Trustees' Statement of Policy on the Delegation of Authority, of October 24, 1969, only after full consultation with representative bodies of the University community, except in emergency cases.
(p. 59)
2. That committees of the Board of Trustees and committees of the Council of the Princeton University Community hold joint meetings for an exchange of views on general or controversial issues.
(pp. 63, 65)
3. That the Board of Trustees and its committees make some of their sessions public, in whole or in part.
(pp. 63, 65)
4. That the Board of Trustees regularly make public statements of the reasons for its actions on major issues.
(pp. 63, 65)

The Presidency

We recommend:

1. That at least one faculty representative from each Division of the University and at least one member of the non-tenured faculty participate in the deliberations of the committee elected to advise the Board of Trustees in any future search for a President of the University.
(p. 68)
2. That representatives of the student body participate in consideration of candidates for President of the University.
(p. 68)
3. That student and faculty members consulted by the Board of Trustees be elected by a procedure which will insure, insofar as that is possible, that they represent such diversity

of opinion as may exist within the student body and the Faculty.
(p. 68)

The Undergraduate Assembly

We recommend:

1. That the Dean of Students seek the advice of the Undergraduate Assembly regarding the allocation of grants-in-aid to organizations of undergraduate students.
(pp. 82-83)
2. That the Dean of Students and the Dean of the College (or their representatives) regularly attend meetings of the Undergraduate Assembly to report, and answer questions about, the current and prospective activities of their Offices.
(pp. 82-83)
3. That the Offices of the Dean of Students and the Dean of the College provide a reasonable amount of clerical assistance to the Undergraduate Assembly and its Committees on the Course of Study and Undergraduate Life.
(pp. 82-83)

The Organization of the Graduate Student Body

We recommend:

1. That a University-wide body of graduate students be established to serve as a forum for expression of opinion on matters of interest to graduate students and to represent the views of graduate students to other bodies in the University and to the University's administrative officers; that such a body include one member from each of the academic departments and two members from each of the residentially based committees of graduate students; and that any quasi-legislative functions be assumed by such a body only with the consent of the graduate student body as a whole.
(pp. 87-88)
2. That the Faculty instruct the Dean of the Graduate School as follows:
   (a) To invite the Graduate students of each department and each of the three residentially based committees of graduate students to indicate their views on the desirabil-

ity of establishing a body of this sort and their willingness to appoint members to it.

(b) In the event that two-thirds or more of these groups respond positively, to stand ready to help in the formation of such a body, to consult with it, and otherwise to facilitate its operation.

(pp. 87-88)

3. That the Council of the Princeton University Community, the Faculty, and officers of the University satisfy themselves that such an organization of graduate students is properly constituted before delegating quasi-legislative authority to it.

(p. 88)

Part III

Communication

We recommend:

1. That more information and more accurate information regarding the organization of the University and of its procedures for setting policy be regularly published in *The Undergraduate Announcement*, *The Graduate Announcement*, and the *General Catalogue*.

(p. 95)

2. That the organization of the University and its procedures for setting policy regularly be made a subject for discussion with freshmen, new graduate students, and new members of the faculty and staff.

(p. 95)

3. That the Administration encourage the hiring of student administrative assistants by both the academic and non-academic departments of the University.

(p. 95)

4. That the Secretary of the University develop procedures for making documents relating to the governing of the University and to current issues of University policy easily available to members of the University community at Firestone Library and at the various branch libraries.

(p. 96)

5. The President of the University, annually and early in the fall term, report on the state of the University, and suggest

the problems and goals of most immediacy to it, in a public and joint meeting of the Council of the Princeton University Community, the Faculty, the Undergraduate Assembly, and the Staff Council.

(p. 97)

6. That the University publish its *Newsletter* more frequently, consider revisions in its composition, and distribute it to students as well as to members of the faculty and staff.

(pp. 96-97)

7. That the *Daily Princetonian* consider ways to broaden its readership in the University community and its coverage of the discussions in, and the decisions of, decision-making bodies.

(pp. 97-98)

APPENDIX 7

THE COUNCIL OF THE PRINCETON UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

CHARTER

1

The Council of the Princeton University Community shall have authority to

consider and investigate any question of University policy, any aspect of the governing of the University, and any general issue related to the welfare of the University; and to make recommendations regarding any such matters to the appropriate decision-making bodies of the University or to the appropriate officers of the University;

make rules regarding the conduct of resident members of the University community, which rules shall be binding on them; but the Council may delegate authority to make rules, and, with respect to matters mainly of concern to a particular group within the University community, the authority to make rules shall normally be delegated to a body representing that group or shall be exercised in a manner otherwise acceptable to the members of that group;

oversee the making and the applying of rules regarding the conduct of resident members of the University community, whether such rules shall have been made by other bodies within the resident University community, or by the Council itself, or by officers of the University; such oversight shall be exercised for the purpose of insuring that such rules protect the rights of individuals and the legitimate interests of the University, and that they are clear in meaning, fair, enforceable, and in conformity with the law;

adopt such by-laws and rules of procedure as are necessary or convenient for the exercise of its authority.

2

2.1 The membership of the Council of the Princeton University Community shall consist of

the President of the University, the Provost, the Financial Vice-President and Treasurer, the Dean of the Faculty, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Dean of the College, and the Dean of Students;

eighteen members of the Faculty, among whom each Division must be represented by at least two members and the non-tenured faculty by at least five members;

fourteen undergraduate students, among whom will be the President, the Vice-President, the Secretary, and the Treasurer of the Undergraduate Assembly, and at least four undergraduate students who are not members of the Undergraduate Assembly;

eight graduate students, among whom each Division must be represented by at least one member;

four alumni of the University;

one member each from among the Professional Library Staff, the Staff Council, the Professional Research Staff, the Professional Technical Staff, and the Office Staff;

and one member from the staff of the University who holds none of the offices and is a member of none of the groups so far indicated.

2.2 A Legal Counsel, the Chairman of the University Research Board, and other officers of the University shall meet with the Council as may be necessary and may speak to issues, but shall be without vote; and, upon the invitation of the Council or of its Executive Committee, other members of the University Community who are not members of the Council may also participate in the deliberations of the Council, although not in voting.

2.3 Before the April meeting of the Faculty, the Advisory Committee on Appointments and Advancements of the Faculty shall present to the Faculty by mail twice as many nominees as there are vacant posts to be filled by Faculty representatives on the Council. Additional nominations to the Council may be made from the floor at the April Faculty meeting. On May 1, the Clerk of the Faculty will mail to each member of the Faculty entitled to vote a ballot containing the list of nominees, with instructions to return his ballot to the Clerk's office by noon of May 10, at which time the poll shall be closed. Voting shall be according to the system of the single

transferable vote, modified, when that is necessary, to insure representation for each Division and for non-tenured members of the Faculty as provided in Part Two, Section One above. Faculty representatives on the Council shall be elected to serve for a term of three years, terms to begin at the beginning of the academic year, and with the terms of six such representatives to be completed each year.

2.4 At the first regularly scheduled meeting of the Undergraduate Assembly after its fall elections, and, similarly, at the first regularly scheduled meeting of the Assembly after its spring elections, the Executive Committee of the Assembly shall present to the Assembly twice as many nominees as there are vacant posts to be filled on the Council by undergraduate students. In each case, additional nominations may be made from the floor at the same meeting or at the next regularly scheduled meeting, at which time, nominations being closed, elections for the vacant posts shall be held. Voting shall be by secret ballot according to the system of the single transferable vote, modified, when that is necessary, to insure membership on the Council of at least four undergraduate students who are not members of the Undergraduate Assembly. Representatives of undergraduate students on the Council shall be elected by the Assembly to serve for a term of one year or until their successors shall have qualified, and, of those who are not *ex officio* members of the Council, the Assembly will normally elect five in the fall and five in the spring.

2.5 At a meeting in April a University-wide body representing graduate students shall nominate for membership on the Council at least twice as many graduate students as there are posts to be filled on the Council by graduate students and such nominations shall be made public. Additional nominations may be made on petition of any twenty-five regularly enrolled graduate students, but nominations shall be closed and elections shall be held no later than May 10. In such elections, all regularly enrolled graduate students shall be entitled to vote, and voting shall be by secret ballot according to the system of the single transferable vote, modified, when that is necessary, to insure representation from each Division. Representatives of graduate students on the Council shall

be elected for a term of two years, terms to begin at the beginning of the academic year, and with the terms of four such representatives to be completed each year.

2.6 Before the April meeting of the Staff Council, a nominating committee chosen by that group shall present to its members by mail the names of at least two nominees for the post on the Council of the Princeton University Community that is to be filled by a member of the Staff Council. Additional nominations for the post may be made from the floor at the April meeting of the Staff Council. As soon thereafter as may be practicable, the President of the University shall cause to have sent to each member of the Staff Council a ballot containing the list of nominees, with instructions to return it to the President's office within ten calendar days, at which time the poll shall be closed. Voting shall be according to the system of the alternative vote. Members of the Staff Council shall be elected to serve on the Council of the Princeton University Community for a term of one year, the term to begin at the beginning of the academic year.

2.7 Before a meeting in April of the Professional Library Staff, a nominating committee chosen by that group shall present to its members by mail the names of at least two nominees for the post on the Council to be filled by a member of the Professional Library Staff. At a meeting in April additional nominations may be made from the floor. As soon thereafter as may be practicable, the University Librarian shall cause to have sent to each member of the Professional Library Staff a ballot containing the list of nominees, with instructions to return it to his office within ten calendar days, at which time the poll shall be closed. Voting shall be according to the system of the alternative vote. Members of the Professional Library Staff shall be elected to serve on the Council for a term of one year, the term to begin at the beginning of the academic year.

2.8 Alumni representatives on the Council of the Princeton University Community shall be nominated by the Nominating Committee of the Alumni Council, and the names of the nominees shall be presented to the Alumni Council before its spring meeting. At that meeting additional nominations may

be made from the floor, and, nominations being closed, an election shall be held. Alumni representatives on the Council of the Princeton University Community shall be elected to terms of two years, such terms to begin at the beginning of the academic year. Normally, two alumni representatives will be elected each year.

2.9 If there is no representative body to act on behalf of a group to be represented on the Council, the Council itself may elect members to represent that group, nominations for all such posts having been made by the Executive Committee of the Council; or the Council may make whatever other arrangements for the selection of such members it deems desirable.

2.10 Any member of the Council may be recalled by the body by which he was chosen. For all members except those representing graduate students, such a recall vote shall be held upon petition of one-fourth of the members of that body, or as may otherwise be provided by it. For members representing graduate students, a recall vote shall be held upon petition of two hundred regularly enrolled graduate students. In any recall vote, a majority of the votes cast for recall shall cause the recall of the member and his seat shall thereby become vacant.

2.11 If a vacancy shall occur in any post on the Council before the member elected to fill that post shall have completed his term, the vacancy shall be filled for the remainder of the unexpired term in the same manner in which the member who held that post was chosen; excepting that, where but one vacancy is to be filled and the member who held the vacant post was elected by the system of the single transferable vote, election by the system of the alternative vote shall be deemed equivalent.

2.12 No person shall simultaneously hold more than one membership on the Council.

2.13 Representatives on the Council, excepting those elected by the Council itself, shall regularly, by appropriate means, report on the activities of the Council to the bodies by which they were elected.

2.14 The Council shall be the judge of the qualifications of its members.

3.1 The President of the University, or in his absence the Provost, shall be the presiding officer at meetings of the Council.

3.2 The Secretary of the Council shall keep the minutes of all meetings, notify members of the Council of special meetings and of important matters proposed for action at any meeting, make public the reports of the Council and its committees and the minutes of all meetings not held in executive session, and perform the duties appropriate to the recording secretary of a deliberative body. He shall be appointed by the Executive Committee of the Council with the advice and consent of the Council, to serve for a term of one year.

3.3 The Council shall, at its first meeting of the academic year, adopt a schedule of meetings for the remainder of the year, which schedule it shall make public.

3.4 The President of the University, or in his absence the Provost, may at his discretion call a special meeting of the Council. The President of the University, or in his absence the Provost, shall call a special meeting of the Council on the request of a Committee of the Council, of any ten members of the Council, of any body electing representatives to the Council, or of a University-wide body representing graduate students. The call for a special meeting shall state the purpose for which the meeting is called.

3.5 All important proposals shall be delivered in writing to the Secretary of the Council not less than five calendar days preceding the meeting at which they are to be introduced, and the Secretary shall cause such proposals to be distributed to members of the Council and placed on the Order of Business for that meeting, provided that no such proposal offered by an individual member shall be so treated unless it shall have been seconded by another member. This rule may, however, be suspended by a vote of a majority of those present and voting at a meeting of the Council.

3.6 The Secretary of the Council shall make public the Order of Business at any meeting of the Council at least two days in advance of that meeting, if it is a regularly scheduled one, or at the time it is called, if it is a special meeting. Meetings of the Council shall be open to members of the University

community to attend as spectators, except that the presiding officer of the Council shall, on the vote of a two-thirds majority of the Executive Committee of the Council, or on the request of one-third of the members of the Council present and voting, call the Council into executive session.

3.7 A quorum of the Council shall consist of fifteen of its voting members.

3.8 The parliamentary procedure at meetings of the Council shall be that of *Robert's Rules of Order Revised*, with the following modifications:

To Section 60. Reports of committees containing matters which should be of record shall be in writing. Unless otherwise ordered, these reports shall be made public and placed on file, and only the recommendations in them which are adopted shall be recorded in the minutes.

To Section 55. When the Council goes into Committee of the Whole, the officers of the Committee shall be those of the Council. A motion to go into the Committee of the Whole is not debatable.

To Section 36. A motion to reconsider may be moved at the meeting in which the original vote was taken, or at the next meeting, by anyone present when the vote was taken who did not vote in the minority.

To Section 58. The presiding officer shall have the same right of debate as other members, and need not yield the chair when speaking.

To Sections 7 and 42. The maker of a motion shall be permitted to close the debate on that motion even after the previous question has been voted. A member may speak a second time on a motion in order to clear a matter of fact, or to explain himself in some material part of his first speech.

4

4.1 The Executive Committee of the Council shall set the Order of Business for meetings of the Council, and, with the Council's consent, shall appoint the members and designate the chairmen of all standing committees of the Council, except members or chairmen serving *ex officio* and the Chairman of the Judicial Committee, who shall be appointed by the President of the University with the consent of the Council.

Such appointments shall be presented to the Council for its approval at the first meeting of the Council in the fall term, notice of such appointments having been given to members of the Council at least five days in advance of that meeting. The Executive Committee may consider any matter within the jurisdiction of the Council and, subject to the approval of the Council at its next regularly scheduled meeting, may appoint such special committees as it deems necessary or desirable.

4.2 The Executive Committee of the Council shall consist of fifteen members, who shall include the President of the University; at least six members of the Faculty; the President of the Undergraduate Assembly and at least two other undergraduate students; and at least two graduate students. The Provost shall normally meet with the Executive Committee, and, when representing the President of the University, shall have the vote. Other officers of the University may sit with the Executive Committee and speak to issues but shall be without vote.

4.3 As soon after May 10 as shall be practicable, the Clerk of the Faculty shall mail to each member of the Faculty entitled to vote a ballot containing the names of the eighteen members of the Faculty who are to serve as members of the Council for the ensuing year. The Faculty will be instructed to vote for six of these to serve terms of one year as members of the Executive Committee of the Council, those terms to begin at the beginning of the next academic year. Voting will be according to the system of the single transferable vote, modified, when that is necessary, to insure that at least one of the six chosen will be a non-tenured member of the Faculty and that each Division is represented among those chosen.

4.4 As soon after each election of representatives of undergraduate students to the Council as may be practicable, the Undergraduate Assembly shall elect two from among the undergraduate students who are members of the Council, to serve as members of the Executive Committee of the Council until their successors shall have qualified. Voting shall be according to the system of the single transferable vote.

4.5 As soon after the election of graduate student representatives to the Council as may be practicable, a University-wide body

representing graduate students shall elect two from among such representatives to serve terms of one year as members of the Executive Committee of the Council, those terms to begin at the beginning of the next academic year. Voting shall be according to the system of the single transferable vote.

4.6 As soon as may be practicable after representatives on the Executive Committee of the Faculty, of undergraduate students, and of graduate students shall have been chosen for the ensuing year, the Executive Committee shall present to the Council by mail the names of at least six members of the Council whom it nominates to serve terms of one year as members of the Executive Committee, those terms to begin at the beginning of the next academic year. Additional nominations may be made from the floor at the next meeting of the Council. As soon after that meeting as may be practicable, the Secretary of the Council will mail to each member of the Council ballots containing the list of nominees, with instructions to return his ballot to the Secretary by noon of the day ten days later, at which time the poll shall be closed. Three members of the Executive Committee shall be elected from among the nominees, and voting shall be according to the system of the single transferable vote.

4.7 Any member of the Executive Committee may be recalled by the body by which he was chosen. Such a recall vote shall be held upon petition of one-fourth of the members of that body, or as may otherwise be provided by it. A majority of the votes cast for recall shall cause the recall of the member and his seat shall thereby become vacant.

4.8 If a vacancy shall occur in any post on the Executive Committee of the Council before the member elected to that post shall have completed his term, the vacancy shall be filled for the remainder of the unexpired term in the same manner in which the member who held the post was chosen; excepting that, where but one vacancy is to be filled, election by the system of the alternative vote shall be deemed equivalent to election by the system of the single transferable vote.

4.9 A quorum of the Executive Committee shall consist of five of its voting members.

4.10 The President of the University, or in his absence the Provost,

shall preside at meetings of the Executive Committee, and may call meetings of the Executive Committee at his discretion. The President of the University, or in his absence the Provost, shall call meetings of the Executive Committee as these are necessary to carry forth its work or when requested to do so by at least five of its members.

4.11 The Secretary of the Council shall meet with the Executive Committee but shall be without vote, unless he shall be a regularly elected member of it. It shall be his duty to keep the minutes of all meetings and to make public the recommendations and proceedings of the Executive Committee in such manner as it may direct.

5

5.1.1 The Council may from time to time establish standing committees, or temporary and special committees, and prescribe their responsibilities and their membership. The following, however, shall be Charter committees, and the provisions in this Charter regarding them shall be subject to change only in accordance with Part Six of this Charter:

1. The Executive Committee
2. The Committee on Rights and Rules
3. The Committee on Governance
4. The Committee on Priorities
5. The Committee on Relations with the Local Community
6. The Committee on Resources
7. The Judicial Committee

5.1.2 Members of the committees of the Council need not be members of the Council, and, unless otherwise provided, members of committees of the Council shall serve for a term of one year, but without limitation as to re-appointment.

5.1.3 Unless otherwise provided, the Chairman of each of the Charter committees shall be one of its members, as that membership is defined in this Charter; and he shall also, normally, be a member of the Council. The chairmen of Charter committees, except for the Committee on Priorities, shall be appointed for a term of one year, but without limitation as to re-appointment. It shall be the duty of the Chairman of each Charter committee to acquaint all new members of his committee with its responsibilities and procedures,

and he may, at his discretion, invite the attendance at meetings of his committee of persons who are not members of it.

5.1.4 Committees of the Council, with consent of the Executive Committee of the Council, may appoint sub-committees, and the members of such sub-committees need not be members of the Council.

5.2 *The Committee on Rights and Rules*

5.2.1 The Committee on Rights and Rules shall, on behalf of the Council, consider and investigate the adequacy of all rules regarding the conduct of resident members of the University community, and the adequacy of the procedures for making and applying such rules. At least once annually and more often if so requested by the Council or by its Executive Committee, the Committee shall report its findings with respect to these matters to the Council, together with any proposals it may have for changes in such rules or in the procedures for making or applying them.

5.2.2 The Committee on Rights and Rules shall consist of the Dean of the Faculty, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Dean of Students, four members of the Faculty, four undergraduate students, three graduate students, and one member from one of the other groups represented on the Council. A Legal Counsel shall meet with the Committee as may be necessary, but shall be without vote.

5.3 *The Committee on Governance*

5.3.1 The Committee on Governance shall, on behalf of the Council, consider and investigate questions relating to the governing of the University, and, at least once annually and more often if so requested by the Council or by its Executive Committee, it shall report its activities, submitting to the Council any proposals it may have with respect to the governing of the University. The Committee shall also consult with the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees regarding the filling of vacancies among the Charter Trustees and the Term Trustees, presenting to the Executive Committee of the Board its views with respect to the qualifications to be sought in nominees to fill such positions, suggesting names of persons that should be considered as nominees, and commenting upon the qualifications of persons suggested as nominees. Further, the Committee shall meet with the Committee on

Honorary Degrees of the Board of Trustees, to consult with it concerning the awarding of honorary degrees.

5.3.2 The Committee on Governance shall consist of the President of the University, three members of the Faculty, two undergraduate students, one graduate student, and one member from one of the other groups represented on the Council.

5.4 *The Committee on Priorities*

5.4.1 The Committee on Priorities shall review the current budget as early in the academic year as may be practicable. It shall also consider issues that have arisen in the course of the preparation of the budget and shall review plans for the development of the University in advance of any final decisions with respect to such plans. The Committee may advise the President with respect to all these matters and shall from time to time report to the Council on the issues before it.

5.4.2 The Committee on Priorities shall consist of the Provost, who shall be its Chairman; the Dean of the Faculty; the Financial Vice-President and Treasurer; six members of the Faculty, among whom each Division must be represented by at least one member and the non-tenured faculty by at least one member; four undergraduate students and two graduate students, chosen with due consideration to the variety of interests represented in the student body; and one member from one of the other groups represented on the Council. The Director of the Budget and the ranking administrative officer responsible for development shall meet with the Committee, but shall be without vote. The Director of the Budget shall serve as the Committee's Executive Secretary.

5.4.3 The Committee on Priorities shall normally meet with the President of the University, to whom it is advisory.

5.4.4 Members of the Faculty who are appointed to membership on the Committee on Priorities shall be appointed to a term of three years, with the terms of two of such members to be completed each year. Other members of the Committee shall also be appointed with a regard to the continuity of the Committee's membership.

5.5 *The Committee on Relations with the Local Community*

5.5.1 The Committee on Relations with the Local Community shall consider, on behalf of the Council, the University's relations with the local community; and, at least once annually and more often if so requested by the Council or by its

Executive Committee, the Committee shall report its activities to the Council, submitting any proposals it may have for improving the University's relations with the local community.

5.5.2 The Committee on Relations with the Local Community shall consist of the Financial Vice-President and Treasurer, or his representatives, and two other administrative officers with duties relevant to the Committee's work; four members of the Faculty; three undergraduate students; two graduate students; and four members from other groups represented on the Council.

5.5.3 The Committee on Relations with the Local Community shall inform the President of the University and the Executive Committee of the Council of plans to consult members and officials of the local community or to gather information from members of the local community.

5.6 *The Committee on Resources*

5.6.1 The Committee on Resources shall consider, on behalf of the Council, questions of general policy concerning the procurement and management of the University's financial resources, and, at least once annually and more often if so requested by the Council or by its Executive Committee, shall report its activities to the Council, submitting any proposals it may have for changes in the general policies of the University with respect to the procurement and management of financial resources.

5.6.2 The Committee on Resources shall consist of the Financial Vice-President and Treasurer; the Chairman of the Department of Economics, or his representative; four members of the Faculty; three undergraduate students; two graduate students; and one member from one of the other groups represented on the Council.

5.7 *The Judicial Committee*

5.7.1 The Judicial Committee shall hear and decide, in the first instance or on referral by another judicial body of the University, cases that involve alleged violations of those established rules and regulations whose violation constitutes a serious infringement of the recognized rights of members of the University community, a serious offense against the University's mission, a threat to the ability of the University to carry on its essential operations, or a substantial impairment

of the common and legitimate interests of the University community. The Judicial Committee may also decide to hear appeals from persons found guilty of violating established rules and regulations, when it has been alleged by such persons that the proceedings against them have not been fair and reasonable.

5.7.2 The Judicial Committee shall consist of three members of the Faculty, two undergraduate students, one graduate student, one member from one of the other groups represented on the Council, and a Chairman, all to be appointed as provided in Part Four, Section One above, and with a regard to continuity in the membership of the Committee. The Chairman of the Judicial Committee shall be without vote, except in the case of a tie vote among the members present and voting.

5.7.3 Appointment to a position on the Judicial Committee shall be contingent on the appointee's recognition of the Committee's judicial role and a commitment on his part to apply established rules and regulations impartially to the facts of individual cases. Prior to his acceptance of an appointment to the Judicial Committee, each appointee shall have examined such rules and regulations and shall have certified his willingness to apply them impartially. Should a case arise in which a member of the Judicial Committee finds that he cannot in good conscience apply established rules and standards, he shall be replaced on the Committee for that case only by a member of a panel of alternate members, which shall have been appointed by the Executive Committee of the Council, with the Council's consent. If this procedure does not provide a complete committee to hear the case, additional alternate members shall be appointed by the Executive Committee of the Council, with the consent of the Council.

5.7.4 No one holding a position on the Judicial Committee shall be a member of the Administration directly responsible for enforcing rules of conduct or for keeping order on the campus, or a member of the Council or a candidate for a position on the Council, or a member of the Undergraduate Assembly or a candidate for a position on the Undergraduate Assembly, or a member of a University-wide body representing graduate students or a candidate for membership in such a body, or

the member of any other judicial body of the University; and no member of the Judicial Committee shall be a judge of his own case.

5.7.5 The President of the University may review decisions of the Judicial Committee, and he may reduce any penalties imposed but may not increase them.

5.7.6 The Judicial Committee shall submit written reports on its disposition of cases to the Council, the Faculty, the Undergraduate Assembly, and a University-wide body representing graduate students, and to other bodies as may be appropriate.

6

Amendments to this Charter may be proposed by any five members of the Council, by any of the bodies that elect representatives to the Council, or by a University-wide body representing graduate students. A vote of two-thirds of the membership of the Council shall be required to amend this Charter. No amendment shall be adopted until at least twenty-one days shall have elapsed between the meeting at which it was introduced to the Council, and the meeting at which it was voted upon, and days which fall in periods during which the University is not in session are not to count in the reckoning of time elapsed.

7

The Council shall be deemed established, and shall have its full authority as prescribed in this Charter, when at least two-thirds of its members shall have been chosen.

8

The Council of the Princeton University Community and the rule-making bodies under its oversight shall make no rule abridging freedom of inquiry, freedom of expression, freedom of publication, or freedom of association.

APPENDIX 8

RESOLUTIONS OF THE FACULTY

JUNE 2, 1969

I

Resolved,

That the proposal of May, 1969, of the Special Committee on the Structure of the University to establish the Council of the Princeton University Community be approved;

that the Charter of the Council of the Princeton University Community submitted by the Special Committee on the Structure of the University be accepted; and

that, as soon as may be practicable in the Fall term of the academic year 1969-1970, representatives of the Faculty to the Council of the Princeton University Community and to its Executive Committee be elected.

Be it recorded,

That the Faculty adopts the foregoing resolution with these understandings:

(1) That exercise by the Council of the Princeton University Community of the authority to make rules regarding the conduct of resident members of the University community is to be consistent with those purposes for which the Council oversees the making of rules by other bodies, that is, to insure that such rules "protect the rights of individuals and the legitimate interests of the University, and that they are clear in meaning, fair, enforceable, and in conformity with the law";

(2) that, in this context, "the rights of individuals" include, but are not necessarily limited to, freedom of inquiry, freedom of expression, freedom of publication, and freedom of association, and "the legitimate interests" of the University do not extend to conduct (professional or any other) not affecting the University;

(3) that, as is clearly implied by the statement on page four of the report of the Special Committee on the Structure of the University of May, 1969, the authority of the Council of the Princeton University Community to make rules regarding the conduct of resident members of the University community, and to oversee

the making of such rules, does not include the authority to make rules, or to oversee the making of rules, on academic subjects.

II

Resolved,

That, as soon as the Council of the Princeton University Community may be established, the Council be requested to give highest priority to developing an explicit statement of those rights of individuals which should limit the making of rules regarding conduct by the Council and by other bodies within the University community; and

that such an explicit statement of the rights of individuals be presented as an amendment to the Charter of the Council of the Princeton University Community.

APPENDIX 9

THE COUNCIL OF THE PRINCETON UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

PROCEDURES OF THE JUDICIAL COMMITTEE

The Judicial Committee was officially formed on November 14, 1969, when the nominations made by the Executive Committee of the Council of the President University Community were confirmed by the Council. The Committee held its first meeting on Monday, November 17, at which it decided that before it could function it must adopt rules of procedure.

The Committee has had to act in advance of the re-formulation of rules governing the conduct of members of the community by the Committee on Rights and Rules, and in the absence of precedents. The rules set forth here will hold until it becomes clear that they need changing or amplifying. The Committee is conscious of the fact that whatever actions it takes in its beginnings may be cited in the future as precedents. It therefore expressly states that the Committee's actions in the future will not be automatically bound by its previous decisions; it must preserve its freedom to learn by experience and to change its opinions in the light of that experience.

The Judicial Committee recognizes that it is not a court of law and must proceed without elaborate legal formalities. The Committee believes, however, that in the context of its charge and the community in which it operates, certain simple and generally accepted standards of fair play can insure that its conclusions will be just, without involving the complex machinery of the law and without necessitating the use of professional legal counsel by either party to a dispute.

I. *Jurisdiction*

The jurisdiction of the Judicial Committee is as outlined in Section 5.7.1. of the Charter of the Council of the Princeton University Community:

"The Judicial Committee shall hear and decide in the first instance or on referral by another judicial body of the University, cases that involve alleged violations of those established rules and regulations whose violation constitutes a serious infringement of the recognized rights of members of the University community, a serious offense against the University's mission, a threat to the ability of the University to carry on its essential operations, or a substantial impairment of the common and legitimate interests of the University community. The Judicial Committee may also decide to hear appeals from persons found guilty of violating established rules and regulations, when it has been alleged by such persons that the proceedings against them have not been fair and reasonable."

II. *Procedure in cases not previously heard by another authority:*

A. Persons wishing to place a case before the Committee shall file a complaint with the Secretary of the Council within a reasonable time, stating the nature and circumstances of the complaint.

B. The Secretary will immediately forward the complaint to the Chairman of the Committee, who will make a preliminary determination of jurisdiction. He may refer the case to another authority or agree to put the case before the Committee.

C. If the case is to come before the Committee, the persons complaining will be instructed to file formal charges with the Chairman of the Committee, who will send copies to the accused.

D. The Committee will set a date for the hearing, allowing a reasonable time for the preparation of the case.

III. *Procedure in appeals:*

A. The person wishing to have a judgment against him reviewed shall file within 15 days* with the Secretary of the Council a request for review, stating the name of the authority that made the judgment and its date.

B. The Secretary of the Council will immediately notify that authority and the Chairman of the Judicial Committee that the request for review has been made.

* during which the University is in session

C. The person requesting the review will then receive instructions from the Secretary of the Council to
   1. Obtain from the authority that made the earlier judgment a summary record of the proceedings in the case, this record to be furnished by that authority simultaneously to the person making the request and to the Chairman of the Judicial Committee.
   2. File with the Chairman of the Judicial Committee within 15 days* of receiving the summary record a memorandum stating in what specific respects he alleges that the procedures or the determination of the penalty against him have not been fair and reasonable. In preparing this memorandum the person requesting review has the right to seek any advice he chooses.

D. The Committee will review the request and decide whether to
   1. Uphold the original decision;
   2. Annul the judgment and send the case back to the previous authority for rehearing or to some other authority;
   3. Hold formal hearings.

   In situations (2.) and (3.), copies of all material submitted will be sent to the previous authority and any other authority to which the case is being referred.

IV. *Hearing procedures:*

The Committee adopts as parts of its own procedure for the conduct of hearings the following recommendations contained in the Report of the Special Committee on the Structure of the University, May 1969, proposing the Council of the Princeton University Community.

Persons accused shall

A. have the right to present witnesses and question opposing witnesses, and to obtain upon request a summary record of the proceedings of the Committee;

B. have the right, upon request, to an open hearing, subject to conditions analogous to those set forth in the faculty's vote of March 17, 1969, concerning open hearings for undergraduates;

* during which the University is in session.

C. be entitled to have an adviser from among the resident members of the University community[1] at any hearing, open or closed, who may speak on his behalf.

V. *Decisions*

When the Committee has reached its decision, the Chairman will notify the parties and then those authorities mentioned in Section 5.7.6 of the Charter of the Council and the press of the Committee's disposition of the case. In such notification both majority and minority opinions if any will be included.

Note that these are new procedures being adopted by the Judicial Committee to guide its own deliberations. While we believe them to be fair, they cannot be applied retroactively to judge the actions of other officers or other committees of Princeton University. In the present evolutionary stage of the Council of the Princeton University Community, made clear in the "Proposal" and the history of the concept, generally accepted principles of conduct, justice, and fair play will of necessity have to be drawn upon, along with formally established codes of behavior, in weighing the merits of particular decisions.

Ahmet S. Cakmak
William S. Dix, *Chairman*
Henry N. Drewry
Stephen Fuzesi, Jr.
Arthur Mendel
Edward L. Morse
Robert R. Wolff

[1] The Report states (page 3, footnote): "In using the term 'resident members of the University community,' we refer to all regularly enrolled students and all persons regularly employed by the University." The report suggests that the adviser mentioned under 1(c) above be "from within the University community." The Judicial Committee has been advised in a memorandum from the Chairman of the Special Committee that drafted the Proposal that they intended the phrase "within the University community" to refer to resident members of the community in the sense explained in their footnote.

APPENDIX 10

THE COUNCIL OF THE PRINCETON UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY JUDICIAL COMMITTEE

CONDUCT OF HEARINGS

1. The Chairman of the Judicial Committee shall preside. If in extraordinary circumstances the hearings must be conducted in the absence of the Chairman, the Committee shall elect a chairman *pro tem* from among its members, selecting a person from the alternate panel to replace him as a regular voting member so long as the Chairman shall be absent. The presiding officer shall have no vote except to resolve the tie.
2. Five members, not including the Chairman, shall constitute a quorum. All decisions shall be made by a majority of those present and voting.
3. Hearings shall be closed unless the persons under accusation (in a case heard first by the Committee) or the persons appealing a prior decision request an open hearing, but the Committee may close a hearing to the public when it considers this necessary to keep order. The Committee may go into private session at any time at the request of any member and its deliberations shall always take place in private session.
4. The Secretary of the Committee shall prepare a summary record which shall be available to both parties after approval by the Committee. In addition, all proceedings of the hearing shall be recorded, to be transcribed at the discretion of the Committee.
5. The persons accused, the persons making an appeal, and the complainants may be present throughout a hearing, except during private sessions of the Committee. Witnesses may be present at the discretion of the Committee.
6. At the opening of a hearing the Chairman shall state the charge being made or the basis of the appeal being made. (All parties shall have been supplied with a written state-

ment of the charges or the basis of the appeal sufficiently in advance of the hearing for their cases to have been prepared, as provided in the "Procedures of the Committee.")

7. In cases not previously heard, the Chairman shall call first upon the persons bringing charges to present their case, presenting witnesses or offering documentary evidence. Following their presentation, the Chairman shall call upon the accused persons to present their defense, presenting witnesses or documentary evidence if they wish.
8. In appeals cases, the order or procedure shall be reversed, the persons making the appeal presenting their case first. Note that in cases not previously heard the burden of proof is on the accusers, while in appeals from previous decisions the burden of proof is on the persons making the appeal.
9. Each side may
    a. Be accompanied by an adviser from within the University who may speak, assist in questioning witnesses, etc.
    b. Question witnesses or speak in direct rebuttal of opposing evidence.
    c. Question the admissibility of evidence. The Chairman shall make a ruling if there is any dispute. If any member of the Committee challenges a ruling, the question shall be decided immediately by majority vote of the voting members of the Committee.
    d. Make concluding statements of reasonable length.
10. When the Committee has reached its decision, the Chairman will notify the parties and then those authorities mentioned in Section 5.7.6 of the Charter of the Council and the press of the Committee's disposition of the case. In such notification both majority and minority opinion if any will be included. If the hearing has been closed the Committee in making its public report will be guided by the principles concerning the confidential nature of students records set forth in Annex 2 of "Students and the University."

Approved by the Committee on January 13, 1970

APPENDIX 11

Statement of Policy on Delegation of Authority

Adopted by the

Board of Trustees of Princeton University

October 24, 1969

In order to clarify the actual practice and procedures followed in the governance of the University, the Board of Trustees declares its intent, in matters of policy as well as of operations, to continue to delegate broad authority to the President and, through him, to the Officers of the Administration, the Faculty, and the Students as more specifically set forth below. While the Trustees may and do delegate authority in wide areas, they cannot either delegate it irrevocably or consign to any other parties their final responsibilities under the law and the terms of the Princeton Charter.

Policy initiative in almost all areas rests with the President and various members of the resident University community. Beyond this there have evolved, generally speaking, three modes by which Trustees share or delegate, normally through standing or special committees, powers and responsibilities in University operations and decision making.

General review: In electing members of the Faculty, the Trustees are guided almost entirely by the recommendations of the President and the Advisory Committee on Appointments and Advancements and exercise their responsibility through a continuing review of the quality of the President's leadership in the maintenance of a highly qualified faculty and by a periodic check of the integrity and efficiency of the procedures followed in the appointment and advancement of faculty members. In matters of curriculum, the creation and abolition of courses, the establishment of requirements for degrees, the prescription of academic procedures, and in most matters within the purview of the University Research Board, the Trustees have delegated their authority to the President and Faculty to be exercised through the appropriate bodies and officers of the University. Procedures for recruiting new students, criteria for admissions, and continuing relations with

the leadership of schools are the responsibility of the President, the Dean of the College, and the Director of Admission acting pursuant to policies determined with the advice of faculty and student committees on admission, subject to the general review of the Trustees. Oversight of student life and discipline, including the formulation of rules of conduct and dormitory regulations, has been delegated to the President and Faculty to be exercised through various faculty and student groups in accordance with duly constituted procedures.

The functioning of the Library is supervised by the Librarian under the direction of the central administration, with the advice of faculty and student committees, the Trustees' concern being directed to the overall quality of the Library and the effectiveness of its operations. Likewise, in the areas of health and athletics the Trustees exercise general oversight, together with occasional professional advice in matters of health and medical care. Requirements for physical space and services are formulated by the several departments in collaboration with the central administration and subject to general review by the Trustees. Plant operations are entirely in the hands of administrative officers. The preparation of the annual budget proceeds through a complex process under the direction and supervision of the central administration, with detailed review by the Trustees, largely through their Committee on Finance, in the light of available funds and previously established priorities.

Prior review: It is assumed that major changes in policy and any substantial new claims on funds will be brought to the Trustees for review before final decisions or commitments are made. The Trustees thus exercise a prior and general review in such matters as the allocation of a significant proportion of the University's resources, the setting of priorities for development, changes in instructional method of broad bearing for the institution, the determination of tuition and fees, steps to be taken to improve the social and living conditions of students, plans calling for new construction, the establishment or abolition of departments or schools, changes in admissions policies affecting sizeable categories of potential students, and changes in relations with outside educational and social institutions and governmental agencies.

Authority directly exercised: In matters concerning financial health and physical properties the Trustees participate directly in

the formulation of policy and the conduct of the business of the University. The Trustee Committee on Finance directs the investment of University funds and supervises the management of the off-campus real estate of the Corporation. The Trustees establish fund-raising policies, approve major development programs, help to identify important sources of potential financial support, and raise funds. Through the Committee on Grounds and Buildings, and with the advice of the President, the Faculty Advisory Committee on Architecture, and other resident members of the University with relevant interests and competence, the Trustees actively supervise long-range physical planning, the determination of architectural styling and landscaping, and the general condition of the University's physical plant.

In addition to what has been indicated above, it is understood more generally that the Board may contribute advice and criticism to the shaping of academic programs and the conduct of affairs in the University. If the Board is to assess general policies wisely, it must be fully and currently informed and be alert and sensitive to particular conditions and requirements. Members of the Board often have experience and competence that can be helpful to the University in its dealing with specific problems, and their advice is most valuable in the early consideration of new policies.

It is the stated intent of the Trustees to continue the general arrangements described above. Modifications of these arrangements may from time to time be adopted in order to improve the University's pursuit of its essential missions and to give the Trustees the benefit of wider points of view in the exercise of the power and authority vested in the Board by the law and the Charter of the University.

APPENDIX 12

AN EXPLANATION OF THE ALTERNATIVE VOTE

The alternative vote is characteristically used in elections in which more than two candidates compete for a single position. A simple majority of the votes cast is needed for election.

Let us hypothesize an election in which four candidates compete for one position, and 100 voters cast ballots.

The first choices of the voters are tabulated (see Table I, column A). Since no candidate has received a majority of the votes cast, the candidate with the fewest votes (Baker) is eliminated. Each ballot indicating him as first choice is now awarded to the candidate listed on the ballot as the second choice. The redistribution of Baker's seven ballots is shown in column B. New totals for the remaining candidates are tabulated (see column C). Since no candidate has yet achieved a majority, the candidate with the fewest votes (Carter) is eliminated; each of his ballots is redistributed to the remaining candidate indicated as the next best alternative. This redistribution is shown in column D. New totals for Ames and Daniels are tabulated. Ames now has 49 votes, and Daniels has 51. Daniels is elected.

TABLE I

	A	*B*	*C*	*D*	*E*
Ames	41	1	42	7	49
Baker	7	–	—	—	—
Carter	16	6	22	—	—
Daniels	36	0	36	15	51

APPENDIX 13

AN EXPLANATION OF THE SINGLE TRANSFERABLE VOTE

The single transferable vote is characteristically used in elections in which many candidates compete for several positions. Let us hypothesize an election in which five candidates are running for two positions and ballots are cast by 150 voters.

The number of votes needed for election (the quota) is given by the formula

$$\frac{\text{number of votes cast}}{\text{number of positions to be filled} + 1} + 1$$

In our example, the quota is 51.

In casting ballots, the voters are instructed to rank the candidates in order of preference. The first choices of the voters are then tabulated, and any candidate receiving the quota is elected. If his total exceeds the quota, the extra votes are redistributed among the remaining candidates. Column A, Table I, lists the number of first-choice votes cast for each of the five candidates in our example. Since Alcott has 76 first-choice votes, 25 votes must be redistributed. There are two alternative methods of redistribution:

(1) Each of the remaining candidates is awarded a percentage of the number of ballots to be redistributed equal to the percentage of second-choice votes he received on all ballots on which the elected candidate was the first choice. This is the method that makes complete use of the information voters have provided about their preferences, and by computer, such calculations can be made quickly.

(2) The proper number of ballots (in this case, 25) is drawn at random from among all the ballots cast for the elected man (Alcott). Each of these ballots is awarded to the candidate indicated as the second choice (see column B, Table I). A new tabulation of votes is made (see column C). Since none of the four candidates has passed the quota, the candidate with the fewest votes (Clark) is eliminated. Each of his ballots is

awarded to the remaining candidate indicated as the next best alternative. The results of this redistribution are shown in column D. Column E shows the new totals for the remaining candidates. The redistribution of Clark's votes has not caused any of the three remaining candidates to pass the quota. Therefore, the candidate with the fewest votes (Eaton) is eliminated, and his votes are redistributed as shown in column F. A new tabulation of the total vote is given in column G. Baker, with 52 votes, is elected. Both positions are now filled, and the election is completed.

Let us suppose that the election rules stipulate that at least one of the two positions must be filled by an undergraduate and that, of the five original candidates, only two, Clark and Eaton, are undergraduates. After Alcott's extra votes were redistributed, Clark had the fewest votes and was, therefore, eliminated. If at least one undergraduate must be elected, Eaton cannot be eliminated. He is therefore elected, both positions have been filled; and, in accordance with the rules, at least one undergraduate has been elected.

TABLE I

	A	*B*	*C*	*D*	*E*	*F*	*G*
Alcott	76	—	—	—	—	—	—
Baker	18	8	26	15	41	11	52
*Clark	17	6	22	—	—	—	—
Dent	21	4	26	5	31	16	47
*Eaton	18	7	25	2	27	—	—

* undergraduates